

**AN EXAMINATION OF THE ANGLICAN  
DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH AS EXPOUNDED  
BY BISHOP JOHN JEWEL**

Edward B. Jones

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1963

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13637>

This item is protected by original copyright

AN EXAMINATION OF  
THE ANGLICAN DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH  
AS EXPOUNDED BY  
BISHOP JOHN JEWEL



ProQuest Number: 10166572

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166572

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

AN EXAMINATION OF  
THE ANGLICAN DEFINITION OF THE CHURCH  
AS EXPOUNDED BY  
BISHOP JOHN JEWEL  
Being a Thesis presented by  
Edward B. Jones  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy



In 5206

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following is a record of research work carried out by me; that the thesis is my own composition; and that it has not been previously presented for any other degree.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Edward B. Jones has spent nine terms at Research Work under my direction and that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance number 16 of the University Court of Saint Andrews, so that he is qualified to submit the accompanying thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

---

Research Supervisor

### CAREER

I matriculated in Millersville State College in September 1947, and in September 1949, transferred to Jones University where I was graduated in June 1951, with the degree of Bachelor of Science.

In September 1951, I matriculated in the Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary from which I was graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Divinity in May 1954.

I matriculated in the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in September 1955, and followed a course leading to graduation in May 1960, with the degree of Master of Theology.

In October 1961, I commenced research on "An Examination of the Anglican Definition of the Church as Expounded by Bishop John Jewel" which is now being submitted as a Ph.D. Thesis.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Professor J. H. Baxter for introducing me to John Jewel, for guiding my acquaintance with this great Anglican, and for his assistance in interpreting the background of the English Reformation and in placing it in its historical context. His suggestions, criticisms, and encouragements have been invaluable.

I would also thank Dr. J. K. Cameron for his aid on matters relating to the Scottish Reformation and the Continental Reformed theologians, especially John Calvin.

For their patience and helpfulness, my appreciation is also due the library staffs of St. Andrews, New College, Edinburgh, the University Library, Cambridge, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton University, and the Divinity School of Philadelphia. I especially wish to express my gratitude to Mrs. F. R. Kompass and my father for their assistance in preparing the final draft of this Thesis.

E.B.J.

October, 1963

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
The Reformation in England . . . . .	1
John Jewel . . . . .	4
The Study of Jewel . . . . .	18
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	26
Authorities . . . . .	28
II. THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	29
The Head of the Church . . . . .	33
The Eternal Church . . . . .	38
The Church and Infallibility . . . . .	42
The Church as a Means to an End . . . . .	49
Summary . . . . .	52
III. THE CHURCH AND SCRIPTURE . . . . .	56
The Sufficiency of Scripture . . . . .	65
The Sole Authority . . . . .	65
The Authorative Books . . . . .	69
The Interpretation of Scripture . . . . .	73
Historical Justification . . . . .	73
Theological Justification . . . . .	79



## CHAPTER

## PAGE

Application of Scripture's Teaching . . . . .	88
Summary . . . . .	94
IV. THE CHURCH AND DIVINE ELECTION . . . . .	100
God's Faithful People . . . . .	101
The Church Visible and Invisible . . . . .	108
The Doctrine of the Church Invisible in	
History . . . . .	116
Summary . . . . .	132
V. THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	136
The Work of the Ministry . . . . .	138
The Ministry Derived . . . . .	138
Ordination not a Sacrament . . . . .	140
The Work of the Ministry Necessary and	
of Primary Importance . . . . .	144
The Care of the Ministry . . . . .	150
The Authority of the Keys of Heaven . . . . .	154
The Keys are the Gospel . . . . .	154
The Keys Committed to the Clergy . . . . .	156
The Two Keys . . . . .	158
Confession . . . . .	159
Excommunication . . . . .	162
The Priesthood of Believers . . . . .	167

CHAPTER	PAGE
Place of the Laity . . . . .	167
Significance of Ordination . . . . .	175
The Organization of the Ministry . . . . .	179
The Threefold Ministry . . . . .	179
Deacon . . . . .	184
The Offices of Priest, Bishop, and Archbishop . . . . .	186
Papal Supremacy . . . . .	195
Summary . . . . .	200
VI. SUCCESSION . . . . .	207
Consecration of English Bishops . . . . .	210
Legality of Anglican Succession . . . . .	219
Consecration of Matthew Parker . . . . .	221
Succession of Doctrine . . . . .	234
Succession of Work . . . . .	237
Summary . . . . .	246
VII. THE NON-ROMAN CHURCHES . . . . .	249
Continental Reformed Churches . . . . .	250
The Protestant Sects . . . . .	260
The Puritans . . . . .	263
The Vestarian Controversy . . . . .	267
Objections to Episcopacy . . . . .	281

CHAPTER	PAGE
The Official Attitude . . . . .	288
Summary . . . . .	299
VIII. THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS . . . . .	303
The Sacraments Defined . . . . .	306
The Rejected Sacraments . . . . .	310
The Two Sacraments . . . . .	322
The Elements . . . . .	322
The Receipt . . . . .	334
The Minister . . . . .	347
Summary . . . . .	352
IX. THE MARKS OF THE CHURCH . . . . .	355
Unity . . . . .	358
Holiness . . . . .	369
Catholicity . . . . .	371
Apostolicity . . . . .	377
Summary . . . . .	381
X. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH . . . . .	384
The Early Church of Rome . . . . .	387
Subjection of Western Christendom	
Through Councils . . . . .	391
The Pope and the Antichrist . . . . .	404
Other Reformers on the Roman Church . . . . .	411
Summary . . . . .	416

CHAPTER	PAGE
XI. CHURCH AND STATE . . . . .	420
The Authority and Responsibility of	
the Ruler . . . . .	422
The Source of Authority . . . . .	423
The Responsibility of the Ruler . . . . .	431
Royal Supremacy Qualified . . . . .	439
The Prince as Supreme Governor . . . . .	442
The Reformation in Scotland . . . . .	452
The Authority of Parliament . . . . .	460
Jewel and Calvin on the Church and State . . . . .	464
XII. CONCLUSION . . . . .	473
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	479
BIBLIOGRAPHY USED TO VERIFY JEWEL'S REFERENCES . . . . .	500

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### I. THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

The reformation of the Anglican Church was characteristically English in that it was effected legally, proceeded slowly and often indeliberately, and only gradually filtered down to the average parishioner. King Henry VIII's desire in severing the ties which bound England to Rome was not to reform the Church's doctrine or alter her ceremonies; it was rather to turn the English Church from the foreign control of the Bishop of Rome back to her ancient obedience to the God-ordained national sovereign. Though during Henry's reign the Church in England acquired a number of bishops with "Lutheran" ideas, the chief alterations in ecclesiastical matters were political and organizational: the substitution of the King's authority for the pope's, the dissolution of the monasteries, the transfer of chantry and certain other funds to the Crown, and the destruction of the shrine of

St. Thomas Becket, Doctrinal variations, other than the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy which had been cited as justification for the above-mentioned changes, were of no significance. The Englishman in his Parish Church would have found little, if any, difference in his parish life between the time of Henry's accession in 1509, and his death in 1547.

From 1547 to 1553, under King Edward VI, the reform of the Church in England, by comparison, proceeded by leaps and bounds and took on a definite Calvinistic complexion. Henry's anti-papalism on political and nationalistic grounds under his son was augmented by a reformation in doctrine which previously would not have been tolerated. By the end of Edward's brief reign, through the efforts of his advisors, Englishmen had experienced significant changes in their accustomed religious life. Many of the old ceremonies had been discarded, and those which remained had been simplified and were now performed in English. Images no longer graced niches in Churches nor presided over elaborate altars which themselves eventually gave way to rustic wooden tables more suitable for the observance of the Lord's Supper than for the celebration of the abandoned Mass.

King Edward was followed on the throne by Queen Mary whose first task was to restore England to her previous allegiance to the See of Rome. Roman Catholicism became the faith of the Church of England; and the Protestant faith was prohibited, though at first opponents of the Roman Church were treated with indulgence. The necessity to repress Wyatt's rebellion in 1554 and the advent of Cardinal Pole in the same year eventually resulted in a severe persecution of those who held Protestant views and earned for the Queen the unflattering title of "Bloody Mary." Her marriage to the Roman Catholic Spaniard Philip II and her support of Spain against France added to her unpopularity. The Queen's inability to bear children, together with the loss of Calais, brought her already unhappy reign into greater disrepute and paved the way for Elizabeth's joyous reception upon her accession to the throne of England in 1558.

The new Queen had become the sovereign of a confused and somewhat disorganized people who had suffered much from the inconsistent religious policies of the previous reigns. Under Henry both Romanist and Protestant lost their lives, while under Mary many more were consumed by the fires at Smithfield for their re-



formed convictions, and others were forced to flee to the safety of Protestant cities on the Continent. The head of the Church in England had been changed from the pope to the king and back again to the pope. The English Church was first Roman Catholic then Catholic (though not Roman) under Henry, was Protestant during Edward's reign, and once again found herself in the papal fold under Mary.

Appreciating what had gone before, Elizabeth recognized the acute need to settle the faith of the English Church once and for all in a manner which would unite the majority of her subjects. The Queen adopted a broad ecclesiastical policy, restoring religion essentially to the state which had obtained in the early part of her brother's reign. She permitted herself to be acknowledged the Church's "Supreme Governor" and let it be known that this was a title which she took seriously. Thus the Elizabethan Settlement was effected.

## II. JOHN JEWEL

The need for a spokesman on behalf of this Settlement was felt early in Elizabeth's reign -- one who could interpret the establishment to the uncertain people of England and defend it against the increasing



onslaughts of the Roman Church. The man selected by Secretary Cecil for this momentous task was John Jewel.

Jewel was a logical choice for this important undertaking. Under the tutorage of John Parkhurst in Merton College, Oxford, Jewel had early acquired evangelical convictions which were confirmed and strengthened through his association, during his subsequent tenure in Corpus Christi College, with Peter Martyr. Later, while an exile from the Marian persecutions, he worked closely with Martyr both in Strasbourg and Zurich. During this period his friends included many fellow exiled Englishmen who had been in positions of trust under the late King Edward and who were destined for places of leadership under Elizabeth in the following years. These influential persons took note of Jewel's scholarly ability and moderate disposition and came to appreciate his evangelical zeal, and without doubt were instrumental in his later rise to authority. In addition to his own countrymen with whom he associated while in Zurich, there were many notable Continental theologians, especially Henry Bullinger to whom he looked with respect and with whom he carried on a correspondence until his death in 1571.

Upon his return to London on March 18th, 1559, Jewel was immediately caught up in ecclesiastical matters by being one of the Anglican divines who opposed the Roman bishops in the fruitless Westminster Disputation of March 31st.<sup>1</sup> He continued to gain in notoriety through assisting in the formulation of the Twenty Articles which were presented to Elizabeth,<sup>2</sup> and on July 18th, "Conge D'Elire" were issued for his election to the See of Salisbury. On January 21st, 1560, after participating in an exhausting but educational visitation commission in Devonshire,<sup>3</sup> he was consecrated, and at the end of May took up residence in Salisbury<sup>4</sup> where, except for occasional visits to London, he remained until his death.

While in London, between his election and his

---

1. See letters of Jewel to Martyr of March 20th and April 6th in Works of Bishop Jewel, edited for the Parker Society by John Ayre (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 4 vols., 1845-1850), Vol IV, pp. 1200-1204.

2. See below, p. 253, note no. 1.

3. See letters of Jewel to Martyr, one undated, the others of August 22nd and November 2nd, 1559, in Works, IV:1210-1211, 1214-1218.

4. See letter of Jewel to Peter Martyr, May 22nd, 1560, in ibid., IV:1233-1235.

consecration, Jewel delivered a sermon at Paul's Cross on November 26th, which was destined to have far-reaching consequences both for himself and for the Church of England. This was the Reformer's famous Challenge Sermon which was preached before the "lord mare and the althermen and many of the courte" and as "grett (an) audyense as (has ever) bene at Fowllies crosse,"<sup>1</sup> and which was so popular and timely that he was requested to repeat it before the Court on March 17th, and again at Paul's Cross on the second Sunday before Easter. The gist of these sermons was that

. . . if any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor, or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy Scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church, whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved . . .

that certain Roman doctrines and practices had been in use during the first six centuries of the Christian era, he "would give over and subscribe unto him."<sup>2</sup>

---

1, Henry Machyn, The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Tailor of London, 1550-63, edited for the Camden Society by J. G. Nichols (London: Printed by J. B. Nicholes, 1848), p. 218.

2, Jewel, Challenge Sermon, Works, I:20-21,

An attempt was made to answer this challenge by Dr. Henry Cole, the former dean of St. Paul's. The ensuing correspondence between Cole and Jewel lasted until the middle of May, Cole's first letter having been written the day after the first preaching of the Sermon. These challenge sermons are important not so much for their content, for they were soon elaborated upon and superseded by the Reply, the Apology, and the Defence, but because they brought Jewel forcibly to the attention of the authorities, both civil and ecclesiastical, at an extremely opportune time. Hitherto the Church of England had been on the defensive, having to answer Roman Catholic charges; now she was in a position to take the offensive against her opponent through the pen of Jewel.

That the Apology was prompted by official sources is suggested by the events leading up to its completion in the middle of April, 1561. Jewel had delivered his Challenge Sermon three times, twice in the same place and once before the Court, meanwhile carrying on the correspondence with Cole which was published later in 1560. On the 21st of May, the day before his departure for Salisbury, he dined with Secretary Cecil, at which time, as a result of the

sermons, prospects for an apology for the Church may have been discussed. In any event, we know from a letter of Cecil to Throckmorton in Paris of May 8th, 1561,<sup>1</sup> that the Apology was completed by that date, and in all probability had been brought by Jewel to London when he preached at Paul's Cross on April 13th.<sup>2</sup> Several weeks following this, he attended a series of conferences with the Queen, Secretary Cecil, Archbishop Parker, and other divines.<sup>3</sup> During these meetings the likelihood that both the Apology and the Pope's recent bull, "Bulla Celebrationis," confirming another session of the Council of Trent, were discussed, is suggested by the fact that the last part of Jewel's work is totally independent from the forepart and is devoted to an apology for England's absence from the Council.

The purpose of the Apology was to demonstrate

---

1. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, 1561-1562, edited by James Stevenson (London: Longmans Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866), p. 104.

2. Henry Machyn, Diary, p. 255.

3. Letter of Bishop Quadra to Philip, May 5th, 1561 in Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth I., edited by Martin A. S. Hume (London: Eyre and Spottiswoodie, 1892), p. 201.



to the Roman Catholic Church, and to the world, that the English Church, in separating herself from the Roman See, had not departed from the orthodox Christian faith, but had returned to the primitive Church of the fathers, the apostles, and of Christ Himself. The Apology was not an English counterpart to Calvin's Institutes, nor was it intended to be. Being brief, and in form and style reminiscent of the Challenge Sermon and the controversy with Cole, it consisted of six parts. The first was an introduction designed to show that the Roman accusations of heresy, schism, and novelty were unfounded and based on misinformation and malevolence. The second part was a confession of faith, not intended to be a complete and exhaustive statement of the Anglican doctrinal position, but meant to demonstrate the agreement of the Church of England with the Scriptures and the doctrines of the fathers. The third, fourth, and fifth parts contained an elaboration of the confession, indicating Anglican agreement with the major Protestant Churches on matters of faith, and laying the charge of heresy and schism at the door of the Roman Church. The sixth and final part of the work was a treatment of the Anglican attitude toward ecclesiastical councils and a defence of the provincial

gatherings by which England had obtained her freedom from Rome. Following these six parts, Jewel included a brief recapitulation of the Apology.

The publication of the Apology was only the beginning of Jewel's apologetic work on behalf of his Church. Soon after its appearance it came to the attention of the Council of Trent which "saw it, and censured it; and appointed one Frenchman, and another Italian, to answer it; but they gave no answer to it."<sup>1</sup> The task of responding to Jewel eventually fell to Thomas Harding, an English cleric who had conformed during the reign of Edward, reverted to Roman Catholicism under Mary, and several years after the accession of Elizabeth found refuge in the Roman Catholic community in Louvain on the Continent. His first reply to the English Reformer was an Answer to Jewel's Challenge which appeared in the Spring of 1564, and though published three years after the Apology, was designed to rebut the Challenge Sermon and made no reference to Jewel's larger work. In the following year Jewel

---

1. John Strype, Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824), Vol. I, Part 1, p. 428.

penned A Reply unto M. Hardinges answere, a work of over seven hundred pages as it appears in the Parker Society edition of Jewel's Works. Yet his publication of this extensive reply did not permit him to rest, for almost immediately Harding published A Confutation of a book intituled an apologie of the Church of England, directed, as the title indicates, specifically against the Apology. Jewel thereupon immediately set to work on his most extensive and detailed work: the Defence of the Apology, which Dixon calls "one of the most complete pieces of controversy in the world,"<sup>1</sup> This work, completed in 1567, was then answered by Harding in A Detection of sundry foul errors uttered by M. Jewel. Jewel answered the Detection with additional comments added to the text of the 1570 edition of the Defence which included the text of the Apology, selected portions of the Confutation, and the text of the Detection itself.

The Apology of the Church of England is agreed

---

1. R. W. Dixon, History of the Church in England from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902), Vol. V, p. 320.



to be Jewel's most outstanding, systematic, and representative work. The Challenge Sermon and the Reply were both directed toward certain specific doctrinal points which were repeated and considered in the Apology, while the Defence of the Apology was its enlargement and elaboration. Because of the brief period of time during which these polemical works were written, and since they were all designed for the same purpose, they express neither a growth or an alteration in Jewel's thought. They rather present the fruit of his formative years in Oxford and later on the Continent, periods for which the Reformer left no indications from which any development in his doctrinal concepts might be discerned. The only change which can be detected in his works between 1561, and his death ten years later was his increasing satisfaction with the Queen's policies and the state of the Church of England, but this was more a result of the establishment of many practices and doctrines for which Jewel had fought, rather than any change in his own thought.

The value of Jewel's works was recognized immediately by both ecclesiastical and civil authorities, and they attained a place just short of official in the Elizabethan Church, being inferior only to the ack-

nowledged standards of the Church of England: the Scriptures, the Prayer-Book, and the Thirty-Nine Articles. Strype referred to the Apology "as an hand-maid of the Holy Bible" which "was approved by the allowance and authority of the Queen, and published by the consent of the bishops and others," and indicated that it was presented to the world by the whole English Church.<sup>1</sup> Secretary Cecil informed Throckmorton that it was he who "had caused the Bishop of Sarum to feign an epistle" and had caused it "to be written . . . in the name of the whole clergy."<sup>2</sup> In 1563, Grindal, the Bishop of London, proposed that a book of articles should be drawn out of the Apology on the Queen's authority, and at the same time Archbishop Parker proposed that the Apology be printed with the Articles of Religion.<sup>3</sup> Though these measures were not carried out, by the Queen's command the Apology was required to be

---

1. Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 426.

2. Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, 1561-1562, p. 104.

3. See Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, p. 387, 397; Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part 1, p. 474.

"chained in all Churches throughout the kingdom,"<sup>1</sup>  
and Parker urged that the Defence be placed in parish  
Churches.<sup>2</sup>

The Bishop's works were as well received by  
foreign Reformers as they were by his fellow Englishmen.  
In a letter to Secretary Cecil of February 4th, 1562,  
Thomas Randolph, writing from Edinburgh, described the  
Apology's reception in Scotland:

The Apologie is so well lyken that there are  
dyvers wyshe that ther were maynie of them in  
thys countrie, or at leaste one man that were  
hable to set forthe so proffitable and neadfull  
a worke. I have cawsed one to be given to the  
Bysshope of Rosse, and purpose to send one other  
to the Bysshope of St Andrews, not to do them  
good, which I know is impossible, but to heape  
muschief upon their heades.<sup>3</sup>

From the Continent, upon receiving a copy of the  
Apology, a gift from Bishop Grindal, Peter Martyr  
wrote a warm congratulatory letter to Jewel, affirming:

---

1. Stephen Isaacson, editor, "Life of Bishop  
Jewel," An Apology for the Church of England (London:  
John Hearne, 1825), p. lxiii, note. See William  
Clark, The Anglican Reformation (Edinburgh: T. and T.  
Clark, 1897), p. 286.

2. See John Ayre, "Biographical Memoir" in  
Jewel's Works, IV:xxviii.

3. In John Knox, The Works of John Knox, col-  
lected and edited by David Laing (Edinburgh: James  
Thin, 1895), Vol. VI, pp. 138-139.

As for the Apology, it hath not only in all points and respects satisfied me, (by whom all your writings are so wonderfully well liked and approved,) but it appeared also to Bullinger, and his sons and sons-in-law, and also to Gaulter and Wolfus, so wise, admirable, and eloquent, that they can make no end of commending it, and think that nothing in these days hath been set forth more perfectly.<sup>1</sup>

The Apology was sufficiently popular throughout the West to warrant its translation from the original Latin into English, French, Italian, Dutch, and Spanish, and to go through numerous editions even during Jewel's lifetime. Following his death it was translated into Greek.<sup>2</sup>

Later generations were as lavish in their praise of the Bishop's defence of the English Church as were his contemporaries. Richard Hooker said of his former benefactor: "Jewel was the worthiest divine that Christendom hath ever bred for some hundreds of years."<sup>3</sup> A century later Gilbert Burnett, Bishop of

---

1. Martyr to Jewel, August 24th, 1562, in The Zurich Letters, edited for the Parker Society by H. Robinson (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1842-1845), Vol. I, p. 339.

2. Jewel, Defence of the Apology, Works, III:186; W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1904), p. 91.

3. Quoted in Stephen Isaacson, "Life of Bishop Jewel," p. c.

Salisbury, paid a noble tribute to his predecessor, claiming:

The first and indeed the best writer of Queen Elizabeth's time, was Bishop Jewel: the Lasting honour of the See in which the providence of God has put me, as well of the age in which he lived; who had a great share of all that was done then.<sup>1</sup>

Stephen Neill referred to Jewel as one of "the two greatest of the positive controversialists of English ecclesiastical history,"<sup>2</sup> while W. H. Frere, the Anglo-Catholic liturgist and historian, spoke of the "fortunate circumstance that such a scholar as Jewel was available for the task"<sup>3</sup> of defending the English Church against Rome, and stated that the Apology was "a masterpiece of terseness and cogency."<sup>4</sup>

The above-mentioned facts attesting Jewel's importance to the Elizabethan Church and the almost

1. Gilbert Burnett, An Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England (London: 1737), 4th edition, p. iii.

2. Stephen Neill, Anglicanism (London: Pelican Books, 1960), p. 119. The other great controversialist mentioned by Neill is Richard Hooker.

3. W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 86.

4. Ibid., p. 91.

official nature of his works,<sup>1</sup> have been cited to indicate the significant place he occupies in English Church history. Jewel was a bridge between the old Roman Church in England and the new reformed English Church. He interpreted what remained in the Anglican Church from the Papal Church in the way of doctrine, polity, and custom in the light of his Protestant faith, and attempted to demonstrate that the reformed doctrines were not innovations, but were a restoration of the beliefs of the ancient Church. His copious and exemplary works, better than any other of this crucial and formative period, form both the epilogue to the reforming efforts of the previous four decades and the first chapter in the history of the Anglican Church's struggle for self-awareness.

### III. THE STUDY OF JEWEL

During the past four centuries Jewel's works have gone through uncounted editions, both in English and in other languages. In 1609, Archbishop Bancroft directed "that all Bishop Jewel's works should be printed

---

1. See above, pp. 13-14.



together in one volume to the end that every parish in England might have one of them."<sup>1</sup> This was the first compilation of the Reformer's works, and since that time various combinations of his separate works, and parts thereof, have been published. It was not until the middle of the nineteenth century that Jewel's works, including all known letters and sermons, were brought together and edited. This four volume set of Jewel's Works, sponsored by the Parker Society and under the scholarly editorship of John Ayre, has become the standard reference for any interested in the writings of the Reformer.

Though Jewel's works have been readily available through the Parker Society edition they have, until quite recent years, invited no serious or systematic study. Jewel's Apology is acknowledged in most histories dealing with the reign of Elizabeth, or histories of the Anglican Church, as a significant work, but little attention is paid to either the work or its author, other than as of passing interest. Jewel's writings have become rather a quarry for both high and

---

1. Edward Cardwell, Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England (Oxford: The University Press, 1844), Vol. II, p. 160.

low-church theologians and historians seeking proof-texts for their various positions. Schools of thought as widely different as those represented by the authors of The Apostolic Ministry and The Ministry of the Church employ quotations from Jewel in support of their views.<sup>1</sup> Though many have quoted the Reformer, interest in his work as worthy of separate study, and as an end in itself, has been absent.

Serious study of Jewel's life has also been lacking. The first biographical treatment was undertaken in 1573, by his friend Laurence Humphrey, president of Magdalen College. This Vita, written in Latin, reflected the author's Puritan sympathies and pictured Jewel throughout as an ardent Puritan, far more radical than he was. The work itself was weak and filled with irrelevant material, while neglecting much relevant information that was, beyond doubt, common knowledge. Humphrey's Vita was never translated into English and was limited to one edition.

---

1. K. E. Kirk, editor, The Apostolic Ministry (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946); Stephen Neill, editor, The Ministry of the Church (London: The Canterbury Press, 1947).



This first biographical study became the basis for practically all future biographies, and hence all contain, to a greater or lesser extent, the same faults as the Vita. Daniel Featley wrote a brief English life to be appended to the 1609 edition of Jewel's works and another which was included in the 1651 edition of Thomas Fuller's Able redevivus, each of which relied heavily on Humphrey's work. C. W. LeBas wrote a biography from material contained in previous works which, in turn, became the source of several nineteenth century biographies appended to Jewel's Apology and other selected works. It was not until Johy Ayre, in editing Jewel's writings, undertook to write a "Biographical Memoir" to be included with the works, that a truly responsible work appeared. Ayre, being thoroughly acquainted with all the Bishop's writings, including his voluminous correspondence with the Reformed leaders on the Continent, did not fall into his predecessor's errors, and portrayed Jewel more accurately and in a more objective manner than had been done in any previous endeavor.

However, the article on Jewel in the Dictionary of National Biography by Mandell Creighton committed the same error which had been made in previous works by showing the Reformer as a reluctant conformist under

Elizabeth and a staunch Puritan at heart. But whereas Humphrey, and subsequent lives based on his work, had desired to demonstrate that Jewel's extreme Protestant views were evidence of a strong Christian faith and evangelical convictions, Creighton, who tended to depreciate the contributions of the Elizabethan churchmen, presented Jewel as typical of his period--a Divine far to the left of true Anglicanism.

The most competent treatment of Jewel's life thus far appeared in 1962 as the first half of a book entitled John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority<sup>1</sup> by W. M. Southgate. This book is a revision of a work which, under the same title, was presented as a doctoral thesis to Harvard University in 1948. In writing "The Life of Jewel," Southgate acknowledges his debt to Humphrey's Vita, but employed other biographies, including that by Ayre, together with relevant material published since the Parker Society edition. Southgate's work is objective, readable, and has profited by the mistakes of previous biographers. He recognizes the Bishop's strengths and weaknesses, and, as did Creighton,

---

1. Published by the Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1962.

portrays him as typical of the Anglicanism of the early Elizabethan Church, yet as one determined to maintain the unity of the English Church, conscientiously devoted to his Queen, but equally determined to advance the cause of the Reformation in England.

The long trend of considering Jewel's works as of only passing interest was reversed by Southgate's work. As the title of his Thesis indicates, the second half of his book is devoted to a detailed consideration of Jewel's doctrine of authority. This study of a basic problem which confronted the sixteenth century Reformers recognized that Jewel's solution was practical, typically English, and of necessity incomplete. Because of the nature of the problem which Southgate set, he concerned himself with Jewel's doctrinal position only insofar as it shed light on the Bishop's concept of doctrinal authority.

In 1960, John Everitt Booty presented a doctoral thesis to Princeton University entitled: A Study of John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England. The purpose of this work was to examine how the Reformer defended the Anglican Church against the assaults of the Church of Rome. Booty made use of a recently discovered letter written by Jewel, at the request of

Cecil, in which the Reformer defended the English clergy against the charge of disunity and heresy. This letter, a copy of which is included in the appendix of Booty's Thesis, although of historical interest, sheds no new light on Jewel's position. Because Booty's work is concerned chiefly with Jewel as an apologist and his methods of defending the Church, no attempt was made to indicate his doctrinal position, though some passing references were made to his theological views.

The primary source of material for this present study was the Parker Society edition of Jewel's Works edited by Ayre. This is the most complete collection of his works available, and with the exception of Jewel's letter contained in the appendix of Booty's Thesis, it contains all the Reformer's extant writings. The text of the Apology in the Works is that of Lady Bacon's English translation which received the full approval of Jewel and Parker upon its completion soon after the Latin edition appeared. Any differences between this text and that which appeared in the later editions of the Defence, which always included the text of the Apology, were noted by Ayre, as were deviations from the 1611 text of the Defence. Since the Works

include Jewel's original Latin text, comparison of any significant words could be made readily. Jewel's answers to Harding's Detection were added to the text of the Defence and are indicated as such in the margin of Ayre's work.

Quotations from the works of Cole and Harding have been taken from their text as it appeared in the Parker Society edition of Jewel's Works after, in the case of the works of Harding, having compared them with the 1565 edition of the Confutation and the 1568 edition of the Detection. Though Jewel did not include the entire text of Harding's Confutation in the Defence, the gist of his argument is not weakened by the omission. In fact his position was so clear that Bishop Parkhurst was reluctant to place Jewel's Defence in the parish Churches of his diocese because he believed "the placing of such controversies in open churches may be a great occasion to confirm the adversaries in their opinions, that having not wherewith to buy Harding's books, shall find the same already provided for them,"<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Parkhurst to Parker, March 7th, 1572, in Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D.D., edited for the Parker Society by John Bruce and Thomas Perowne (Cambridge: The University Press, 1853), pp. 416-417, note no. 2.



#### IV. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Thesis is to ascertain and examine the doctrine of the Church as it was held by Jewel. Since he left no work exclusively devoted to the study of the Church, such as Book IV of Calvin's Institutes, it is necessary to cull his position from those doctrines on which he wrote, and which are based on, or reflect, a certain ecclesiastical orientation. The second chapter of the Thesis is a consideration of Jewel's view of the basic nature of the Church, i.e., her relation to God and her reason for existing. Inseparable from the doctrine of the Church's nature, and basic to Jewel's entire doctrinal position, is his view of the authority and application of the Holy Scriptures, which is dealt with in the third chapter. The doctrine of the Divine Election and its resulting differentiation between the Church invisible, composed of God's faithful, and the visible institutional Church, a doctrine which played such an important part in the theology of the major sixteenth century Reformers, is the chief topic in the fourth chapter. Chapter five discusses the place, purpose, and authority of the three-fold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop in the reformed

Church of England; while chapter six is devoted to an analysis of the way in which Jewel interpreted the doctrine of apostolic succession. In the light of these considerations, chapter seven examines Jewel's position regarding the non-Roman Churches, and compares his views with those of the English government concerning those Churches which had not retained an episcopal polity. A consideration of the ministry and polity of the Church naturally leads from Jewel's attitude toward those bodies which did not possess the traditionally ordered ministry to a discussion, in chapter eight, of the Sacraments whose efficacy previously had been thought to depend on a properly ordained clergy. The way in which Jewel dealt with, and applied the four marks of the Church, i.e. unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity to the Anglican Church, and more broadly to all the major Protestant groups, forms the substance of the ninth chapter. The tenth chapter, based on the previous chapters, is a study of Jewel's position on the Church of Rome. Finally, Jewel's application of the doctrine of Royal Supremacy to the doctrine of the Church, and his concept of the relation between the sovereign and the Church, is treated in chapter eleven.



## V. AUTHORITIES

The authorities used in the writing of this Thesis were Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Fifth Edition (Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam Co., 1947), and William Giles Campbell, Form and Style in Thesis Writing (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1954).

## CHAPTER II

### THE NATURE OF THE CHURCH

It could be stated with much justification that everything said by an individual about the Church, even to the smallest and most non-theological point, is something of an expression of his doctrine of the nature of the Church. With this in mind it may seem either unnecessary or over ambitious to include a chapter on the nature of the Church in a work which proposes to examine in detail the doctrine of the Church as it was expounded by John Jewel. Nonetheless, this inclusion has been made since there are certain concepts basic to a consideration of a doctrine of the Church with which a chapter of this kind can deal more adequately than if these matters had been included elsewhere.

Jewel's view of the fundamental nature of the Church was affected by his opinion of the corrupt Roman Church; thus his approach began on a negative, controversial note. His three point outline of a sermon on Haggai 1:2-4 is illustrative of his basic attitude

toward his task:

1. Wherefore, first, I will prove, by God's grace, that our church hath been overgrown with errors and abuses, as then the temple of Hierusalem was defaced by the Chaldees.
2. Secondly, I will shew what things they be that do stay men from re-edifying of this temple.
3. Last of all, after what sort this church ought to be builded, and so I will leave you to God.<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer believed that before any constructive measures could be taken in the English Church to return her to her lost purity, the heresies, superstitious practices, and human traditions resulting from the domination of the Bishop of Rome first had to be purged away. He was overwhelmed by the number of offenses which Rome had committed:

How many ways and in how many points the church of late days hath dissented from the church of Christ and of the apostles (which no doubt was the catholic church), it were almost an infinite work to reckon up. For they disagree in so many things, that in manner they agree in nothing.<sup>2</sup>

Since the outstanding points wherein the Church of Rome had erred, and had led others to follow her error, will be mentioned hereafter, there is no necessity for re-

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai 1:2-4, Works, II:987.

2. Ibid., pp. 988-989.

numeration here. These deviations from the true Christian faith were first cited in the Challenge Sermon in which Jewel called upon the Roman Catholics to show just reason why the doctrines and practices which the Church of England had abandoned should be retained. The Apology and its Defence elaborated this theme and presented massive support for the Anglican action.

Even the positive rebuilding of the Church of England had certain negative underlying principles, for, based on the Scriptures and early Church custom, it was accomplished chiefly in terms of anti-Roman convictions. An only slightly overdrawn picture of Jewel's essential approach in his controversy with the Roman Church is seen in an illustration which he used to describe the method of his work:

There was a cunning musician that sent his scholars to an ignorant and homely minstrel to learn music of him; but before he sent them out, he gave them this lesson: Whatsoever you see your master do, see that you avoid it; he is unlearned, and his lessons and manner of fingering naught: therefore see you do the contrary.<sup>1</sup>

The procedure which the Church of England was to follow was plain: "Whatsoever we see that they have done that

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:1001.

were our latter fathers before us (the Roman Catholics), that have destroyed Christ's church, let us remember to do the contrary."<sup>1</sup>

Though Jewel was by nature a positive thinker, he lived in an age characterized by contention, and was called upon to take leadership in one of the greatest and most significant polemics in English Church history. Without doubt, he would have felt more at home with a positive construction of an ecclesiastical structure based on the Scriptures and the apostolic Church, but his time demanded a controversialist who could point to errors, and by the Word of God and early precedent, show them to be so. Therefore Jewel was forced into an argumentative position which he handled as one born for the express purpose, though he personally would have desired to work in a less negative context. His attitude toward the nature of the Church, by the character of the situation in which he was called to serve, was strongly colored by the strife in which he was involved.

This chapter is concerned with Jewel's position regarding: (1) Christ as the Head of the Church as

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:1001. Parenthesis mine.

opposed to the pope as Christ's Vicar, (2) the Church as belonging to God rather than to man, (3) the possibility of error in the Church as contrasted with the Roman doctrine of infallibility, and (4) the Church as having a mission on earth rather than being an end in herself.

### I. THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH

Of supreme importance in Jewel's concept of the Church was the lordship of Christ over her. The Roman claim that the Church was "built upon the rock Peter" was answered by Jewel with the unqualified statement: "The foundation of the Church of God is not Peter but Christ."<sup>1</sup> He reminded his disputant of the words of the Apostle Paul: "Other foundation no man can lay, but the same that is laid already, which is Christ Jesus."<sup>2</sup> This belief in Christ as the absolute head over His Church is one repeatedly met in the course of any study

---

1. Thomas Harding, A confutation of a book intituled An apologie of the Church of England in Jewel's Works, IV:361. Jewel's comment is a marginal note on Harding's statement.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1058; I Corinthians 3:11.



of Jewel's work, for it is the center of his whole doctrinal position.

Christ, as Head of His Church, had not delegated responsibility to a vicar to manage her affairs and maintain her order; nor was He an absentee landlord who managed His possessions from afar. He was instead a constant Presence in the Church, since, Jewel declared, without Him "the Church is no church."<sup>1</sup> In affirming this belief, Jewel considered himself to be on dangerous ground and hastened to explain exactly what he meant by the presence of Christ within the Church. Had he not done so he believed that he could easily have been misunderstood as having fallen into one of the chief errors of the Roman Church: the doctrine of transubstantiation, which defined Christ as physically present in the bread and wine of the Eucharist after the consecration by the priest. This doctrine was totally repugnant to Jewel and he took advantage of every possible opportunity to affirm what he believed to be the New Testament doctrine of the Sacrament, especially as regarded the nature of Christ's presence.

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:207.



Christ, the Reformer affirmed, had ascended into heaven and was no longer physically present in any form on earth, though, in a sense, He was still present in the Church. Jewel explained that just as

. . . the sun, not coming down from heaven nor leaving his place, is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our faces, in our hands, in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving his room there, yet nevertheless is present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism and in the sacrament of his body.<sup>1</sup>

The Lord having "absented himself from his whole church"<sup>2</sup> was therefore present in a purely spiritual way. To help resolve this problem which was common to all the sixteenth century Reformers, both British and Continental, Jewel explained his position in terms of the two natures of Christ: the human and the divine--His manhood and Godhead. According to Jewel's belief, Christ left His Church "concerning his manhood,"<sup>3</sup> i.e., He was no longer

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:499; cf. Joseph C. McLeod, The Visible Words of God: An Exposition of the Sacramental Theology of Peter Martyr Vermigli A.D. 1500-1562 (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 116-117.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:263; Augustinus, Sermo CCXXV "In diebus Paschalibus," vi. 4, in Opera Omnia, Tom. V, Col. 1119.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.; Fulgentius, Ad Trasimundum Regem, Liber II, capp. xvii, xviii in S. Fulgentii Ruspensis Episcopi Opera, quae extant, Omnia (Lugduni:1633), pp. 62-63,

physically present in any sense on earth, but, and this was of the utmost importance to the Bishop's understanding of Christ's presence, he insisted: "He hath not left us as touching his divine nature."<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's differentiation and meaning become clearer when consideration is given to his belief in the Church as the Body of Christ. "The Body of Christ" was a phrase not much used by the Bishop, but what it described to him was a concept which underlay his entire doctrine of the Church. By the act of faith two simultaneous things happened in and to the believer: he was indwelt by Christ and was in turn incorporated into the body of the Church, becoming an integral part of that society of which Christ was the Head. There were, Jewel observed,

. . . four special means . . . whereby Christ dwelleth in us and we in him: his nativity, whereby he embraced us; our faith, whereby we embrace him; the sacrament of baptism; and the sacrament of his body. By every of these means Christ's body dwelleth in our bodies . . .<sup>2</sup>

The Apologist proceeded to discuss each of these four "means" in detail, but for our present purposes these

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:252; Vigilius, Divi Vigilli Contra Euthycon, Liber I (Tibingae: 1528), no pagination.

2. Jewel, Reply unto M. Hardinges answere, Works, I:472.

explanations are not relevant. The fact that, in some way, Christ was in each believer was a method of affirming that at one and the same time He could be in heaven with the Father, and yet be present on earth in His Church.

Jewel also likened the Church, the Body of Christ, to the body of a man. Following Paul's reference to the body in I Corinthians 12, he asserted:

The Church of God is as the body of a man. In a man's body every part hath his several office, the arm, the leg, the hand, and foot, do that whereto they are appointed; and, doing the same, they do live together in peace. But if the arm would take in hand to do that which is the duty of the leg, or the foot that is the part of the hand; it would breed great disorder in the whole body. So, if every man in the Church of God seek to do that to them belongeth, the Church shall flourish and be in quiet; but when every man will be busy, and take upon him to look into other; when every private man will govern, and the subject take in hand to rule the prince; all must needs come to wrack and decay.<sup>1</sup>

By thus describing the Church as the body of a man, Jewel gave a further insight into his belief concerning Christ's relation to the Body, and he revealed his position of the relation of individual members of the Body to each other. Christ, as Head of the Body,

---

1. Jewel, Upon the First Epistle to the Thesalonians, Works, II:864.

was Lord of each individual member who, upon being ingrafted into the Church had been placed in a particular situation with his own responsibility. Under Christ each member was obliged to fulfill his calling to the best of his ability, without slacking through the assumption that his work would be performed by another, or by presuming to take upon himself another's duty. When each member strived to do his duty the Body was unified as to purpose and could function as she had been called, under Christ, to do, "We be the members of one body," Jewel declared, "and have one head, and are poured over by one grace, and live by one bread, and walk one way, and dwell in one house,"<sup>1</sup>

The way in which Christ exercised His Lordship over the Church will be considered later under Jewel's treatment of the Holy Spirit's relation to the Scriptures.

## II. THE ETERNAL CHURCH

In Jewel's opinion the Church of Rome had become

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:141-142. This is a quotation from Paulinus, Bishop of Nola. Paulinus, "Epist. ad Aug.," in Augustini Opera Omnia (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1841), Epistola XXX, Tomus II, Col. 121.

chiefly a human institution because she had at her head a human being, she was governed by human beings, and her doctrines and practices were the inventions of men. This position is clearly seen in the Bishop's final answer to Dr. Cole, given in May of 1560. To Jewel's complaint that there was much in the Church of Rome which was not in accord with the doctrines and traditions of the ancient Church, the Roman Catholic theologian responded:

The Church of Christ hath his childhood, his manhood, and his hoarhairs; and, as to one man that is meet to him in one age is not meet for him in another; so were many things requisite and necessary in the primitive church which in our days were like to do more harm than good.<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer, as will be seen later, did not hold the position that it was necessary to limit the Church only to those things which had been practiced in the early Church; what he objected to was the Roman insistence that such "non-scriptural" practices and beliefs be treated as of divine origin.<sup>2</sup> The Roman Church, Jewel contended, had replaced the Word of God and the doctrines and customs of the pure Church of the first five centuries

---

1. D. Cole, Answer to the Bishop of Sarum in Jewel's Works, I:39.

2. See below, pp. 88-92.



with the pleasures and determinations of men, and had substituted the pope for the "Lord of Sabaoth."<sup>1</sup>

The Apologist asserted that the true Church of Christ, as over against the Church of Rome, had been "built by God, that is to say, by the doctrine of God."<sup>2</sup> In spite of human efforts both to destroy and to maintain the Church, she remained God's peculiar possession. "We grant," Jewel affirmed, "the princes and estates of the world have now laid their power to assist the gospel . . . . Nowbeit, the gospel came not first from them. It sprang up and grew by them many wheres against their wills."<sup>3</sup> The Church was God's because she originated in Him and was preserved by Him, and in the sense that she could not be destroyed, she was eternal, for, the Reformer said, identifying the Church of England with "all the holy and learned doctors . . . ., the Church of God hath been ever from the beginning, and shall continue unto the end, and over-spreadeth all parts of

---

1. Jewel, The Reply of the Bishop of Sarum to D. Cole, Works, I:75-80; Defence, Works, III:180; Ibid., IV:918.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Matthew, Works, II:1023; Nilarius, Tractatus in CXXVI Psalmum, 8, in Opera Omnia (Parisii: J. P. Migne, 1844), Col. 696.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:194.

the world, without limitation of time or place."<sup>1</sup>

One of the principal proofs for Jewel that the Church was indeed God's and not man's, and therefore eternal, was the fact that she had endured all that man could do to her. According to the Reformer, that which Jeremiah the prophet had foretold had been fulfilled in the Church of God:

"Many pastors have destroyed my vineyard, and trodden my portion under foot; of my chosen place they have made a desolate wilderness." . . . The Church of God is called the holy place; yet Christ saith, the abomination of desolation, and St Paul saith, the man of sin, shall stand in the holy place,<sup>2</sup>

He continued:

Notwithstanding sometimes by care and diligence she is kept neat and clean, sometimes by negligence she is laid waste and overgrown with weeds; and therefore she is compared unto a garden. Sometimes her light is clear and beautiful, sometimes she waneth and groweth dark; and therefore she is compared unto the moon.<sup>3</sup>

Yet despite such desecration and fluctuation he maintained: "The church of God shall stand still, yea, though

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:190-191.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:994-995; Jeremiah 12:10; Matthew 24:15; II Thessalonians 2:3.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:191.



Rome were possessed with antichrist."<sup>1</sup>

On the belief that the Church of God was eternal and would endure, both Jewel and his Roman Catholic antagonists agreed, but they did not mean the same thing by the same affirmation. In Roman Catholic thought, since the Roman Church was the one true Church of Christ, she was that Church which would exist forever. This claim was based on Christ's promise to be with His Church "all the days to the world's end,"<sup>2</sup> and on His prayer for God to give to the Church "the spirit of truth, to remain with it forever,"<sup>3</sup> Harding told Jewel:

We tell you therefore, it (the Roman Church) standeth, and shall stand, by Christ's presence, and by the Holy Ghost's assistance, to the end. Your cause yet standeth not, but wavereth and tottereth, as that which St Paul termeth "a puff of doctrine," and doubtless shortly fall it shall, as all heresies have fallen.<sup>4</sup>

The Bishop readily agreed with Harding that the promise which he quoted was valid and certainly applied to the Church of God, but he differed with the Romans

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:180. See below, pp. 108-116.

2. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:179-180; Matthew 28:20.

3. Harding, ibid.; John 14:16-17.

4. Harding, ibid.; Ephesians 4:14, Parenthesis mine.

in defining that universal Church.<sup>1</sup> For the Reformer, the Roman Church was not to be identified with Christ's Church:

It is true that Christ saith: "every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up," Upon which words St Hilary saith: "He meaneth that the tradition of man, for which tradition's sake they have broken the law of God, shall be taken up by the roots." Heaven and earth shall pass, and your fantasies and devices, M. Harding, shall pass: The Lord hath spoken it; but the word of God and his Church shall endure forever.<sup>2</sup>

The promise of Christ to be with His Church and to preserve her forever was true, but this promise had not been made to the Roman Catholic Church; it had been made to the catholic Church of God. She was eternal and would last forever because God Himself, on Whom the Church depended, was eternal.

### III. THE CHURCH AND INFALLIBILITY

Since the Church, the Body of Christ, found expression in institutions, she could not be inerrant. This was a belief which Jewel was convinced was based

---

1. See Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:726.

2. Ibid., III:180; Matthew 15:13; Hilarius, Commentariorum in Matt., Cap. XV, 1, in Opera Omnia, Tom. 1, Col. 1003.

on the Scriptures and confirmed by history. According to Roman thought the Church was inerrant when defining matters of faith and morals, as Harding expressed it: "Touching grounds of truth the church erreth not, as that which enjoyeth Christ's promise."<sup>1</sup> Again affirming the same position he declared: "That the . . . church, in points of our faith necessary to salvation erreth, we deny it."<sup>2</sup> Though this doctrine was almost universally held as an article of belief in the Western Church, it had not been officially defined by the time of the Reformation, so that both Harding and Jewel had to depend on the words of notable divines, the traditions of the Church, and the general position of various councils for their sources of authority. Rome, in believing herself to be the only true Church of Christ, limited infallibility to that which she decreed, and applied Christ's promises to the Church only to herself. This attitude was evident in Harding's statement: "The faith of the holy Roman Church is the very catholic faith, which whose forsake shall be companions with devils in everlasting

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:594.

2. Ibid., IV:720.

fire."<sup>1</sup> It was with this definition of infallibility and perfection that Jewel disagreed.<sup>2</sup>

The testimony of the Scriptures regarding not only the possibility, but the inevitability of error in the Church, was for Jewel, clear and indisputable. Noting Paul's statement in his letter to the Galatians: "I fear lest I have laboured amongst you to small purpose, and lest ye have heard the gospel in vain," the Apologist recalled that even the Church of Galatia, which had Paul's personal ministry, had erred, and added: "As for the Church of the Corinthians, how foully it was defiled, it is nothing needful to rehearse."<sup>3</sup> He asked his Roman opponent: "Now tell me, might the churches of the Galatians and Corinthians go amiss, and the Church of Rome alone may not fail or go amiss?"<sup>4</sup>

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:195.

2. The doctrine of infallibility was not officially stated by the Church of Rome until the first Vatican Council (1869-1870) when it was expressly declared: "Neque enim fidei doctrina, quam Deus revelavit, velut philosophicum inventum prosita est humanis ingenii perficienda, sed tanquam divinum depositum Christi sponsae tradita, fideliter custodeinda et infallibiliter declaranda." Sessio III, Caput IV, in Counciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta (Basileae: Herder, 1962), p. 785.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:725; Galatians 4:11.

4. Jewel, loc. cit.

It was necessary, Jewel affirmed with Augustine, to distinguish between "belief in" and "believing" the Church. He declared: "We believe that there is a holy church; but we believe not in the holy church."<sup>1</sup> To believe that there was a holy Church was one thing, but to believe whatever she said was true was another which Jewel was not prepared to accept.

The Scriptures also spoke of a time when the Church would fall away from the truth of the Word of God. The Reformer's interpretation of II Thessalonians 2, Daniel 8, II Peter 2, and Matthew 24 led him to affirm:

Surely Christ prophesied long before of his church, that the time should come when desolation should stand in the holy place. And St Paul saith that antichrist should once set up his own tabernacle and stately in the temple of God; and that the time should be "when men should not alway with wholesome doctrine, but be turned back into fables and lies," and that within the very church. Peter likewise telleth how there should be teachers of lies in the church of Christ. Daniel the prophet, speaking of the latter times of antichrist: "Truth," saith he, "in that season shall be underfoot, and trodden upon in the world." And Christ saith that calamity and confusion of things shall be so exceeding great, "that even the chosen, if it were

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:434; Augustinus, De Fide et Symbolo, Caput X. 21 in Opera Omnia, Vol. VI, Col. 193.



possible, shall be brought into error;" And these things shall come to pass . . . in the temple of God, in the church, and in the company and fellowship of those which profess the name of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel further strengthened his position by showing that he was in agreement with Ambrose, Hilary, and Theodoretus on the inevitability of error within the Church.<sup>2</sup>

Rome's exaggerated claim of infallibility was also answered by Jewel pointing with disgust to her toleration, and often sponsorship, of such evil institutions as brothel-houses in the city of Rome,<sup>3</sup> and her sufferance of such corrupt individuals in the papal chair as John XII,<sup>4</sup> John XIII,<sup>5</sup> Benedict IX,<sup>6</sup> and the alleged female pope Joan.<sup>7</sup> Jewel appreciated the fact

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:727.

2. Ibid.; Ambrosius, Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam, Liber X, 15, in Opera Omnia (Paris: J. P. Migne, 1845), Vol. I, pars posterior, Col. 1808; Hilarius, Comm. in Matt., Caput XXV, 3, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1054; Theodoretus, Comment. in Danielelem, in Theodoreti Operum (Lutetiae: 1642), Tomus II, p. 696.

3. Jewel, op. cit., IV:627; Defence, Works, IV:644.

4. Ibid., III:250; IV:702.

5. Ibid., IV:651.

6. Ibid., IV:702.

7. Ibid., IV:650-656.

that often the practices of a Church did not reflect her official beliefs; but this most certainly had not been the case in the Church of Rome where corrupt practices had grown up as a result of false doctrines. Specific errors mentioned by the Bishop affecting the very salvation of men, e.g., the forbidden reading of the Scriptures, a false doctrine of the Sacraments, the belief in righteousness acquired through external observances, and the pope's usurpation of the place of Christ over the Church will be considered later in more detail. Let it suffice for the present to cite these, together with the before-mentioned examples, as cause for the Reformer to be unceasing in his efforts to show that the Roman Church had so clearly fallen from God's truth that her claim to infallibility was ridiculous.

Yet notwithstanding his denunciation of Rome's pretensions and his conviction that she had erred to the extent of denying her people the message of salvation, the Reformer was able to affirm that Christ's promises to abide with the Church and save her from apostacy were true. Harding's contention "that the whole catholic and universal Church, whose faith we profess, may err,



fall, and fail, that we deny utterly,"<sup>1</sup> was, for the most part, agreeable to Jewel. Though he took exception to his opponent's statement that the Church of Rome professed the faith of the catholic Church, he found the remainder of the assertion acceptable, and in a comment made in the margin beside Harding's words Jewel remarked: "We speak not of the whole universal church, but only of the Church of Rome."<sup>2</sup> It was the whole catholic Church of Christ to which the Lord had made His promises rather than to the Roman Church alone, for she was not coterminous with the universal Church. It was, Jewel believed, possible for individual Churches, such as the Church of Rome,<sup>3</sup> to fall into error, and as history had demonstrated, at times almost the entire Church had abandoned God's truth. But the Reformer believed that it was impossible for the whole catholic Church to fall into apostacy at the same time, or else Christ's pledge would have been for naught. No matter how evil separate

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:725.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:702.

3. Cf. Article XIX of the XXXIX Articles of Religion of the Church of England.

Churches might become, God always preserved, somewhere, a righteous remnant within the Church to maintain His truth; it was in this sense the Reformer believed the Church was preserved from error.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. THE CHURCH AS A MEANS TO AN END

Another important feature in Jewel's consideration of the nature of the Church is suggested by his position on the reality of error within her. In claiming an infallibility in matters of faith and morals he believed that the Roman Church equated herself with God. If, he reasoned, the Church was incapable of doctrinal fault, then any declaration made by her would have to be accepted as an absolute truth, just as if it had come directly from God. The Reformer stated categorically: "The church is not God, nor is able of herself to make or alter any one article of the faith."<sup>2</sup>

In asserting that the Church was not God the Bishop indicated that she was not an end in herself, but was a means to an end. From our knowledge of the general

---

1. See below, pp. 108-116.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:434.

lack of missionary concern in the reformed Churches in the sixteenth century, we should expect the works of Jewel, by their very apologetic nature, to be lacking also in a broad concern. But such is not entirely the case. In his exposition of St. Paul's first epistle to the Thessalonians, Jewel exhorted his readers to follow the example of the Thessalonians and apply to themselves those things said by God to the Christians in that city many years before:

You are (saith he) as the bright sun-beams: they behold you, and rejoyce of you, even as the morning-light. You are an holy city set upon an hill, you cannot be hid: your faith is a pattern of faith, your life is a pattern of life unto them. They have learned of you how to guide their ways. You have called them back from error and from ungodliness to serve the true and living God.<sup>1</sup>

The Bishop then reminded his readers that God had chosen them to make his gospel known in all places; they had been called to build God's Church. It was the duty of God's people to let their light shine forth that others might be aware of their own darkness, for, he declared: "Many thousand eyes are set upon us, to look upon and behold us. Let us be an example of god-

---

1. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:825. Parenthesis is Jewel's.

liness,"<sup>1</sup> The Church was reminded of her responsibility to proclaim the truth which God had revealed, lest, as in the past, the kingdom of God be taken from her and given to a nation that would bring forth fruit. By exhibiting the light of the gospel not only would the Church of England be better enabled to see, but her light would "lighten also the hearts of the pagans and infidels, which are abroad."<sup>2</sup>

Caution must be exercised not to place too much emphasis on this concern for the task and mission of the Church and her responsibility for those outside the faith, but neither should it be overlooked. Repeatedly throughout his writings Jewel criticized the Roman Church for failing in her task by tolerating bishops who were not shepherds, priests who did not preach, deacons who did not serve, and popes who were not mindful of their flock. This positive emphasis on the mission of the Church and the condemnation of the Romans for their negligence was a natural consequence of his doctrine of the nature of the Church; the Church was not

---

1. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:825.

2. Ibid.

God, but had been ordained by God to call others into herself in order to point them to the Lord of the Church. Reminding his fellow countrymen that they were living in a time of special grace and therefore they should "not receive this acceptable time in vain," he called upon them to

. . . remember how many thousands of people perish this day for want of the gospel of God and knowledge of his holy word. We are they whom God hath called to be his children, whom he hath appointed to be saved, whom he hath revived to his grace and mercy. If we have wealth, felicity in this world; let us consider that we have them from God alone . . . O then let us not take these graces of his in vain. Let our lives so shine before men, that they may see our good works, and glorify our father which is in heaven.<sup>1</sup>

#### V. SUMMARY

Jewel's treatment of the fundamental nature of the Church was neither unique nor revolutionary by Reformation standards, but it does reveal certain underlying concepts which colored his entire ecclesiastical doctrine. His approach to the Church was basically theocentric, a natural reaction to the man-centered traditions and doctrines he believed held by the Roman Church and a genuine reflection of what he believed to

---

1, Jewel, On II Corinthians 6:1, 2, Works, II:1090.

be the teaching of the Scriptures.

Although "Deism," as it was to be known in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, was largely unknown to the sixteenth century Reformers, Jewel regarded certain aspects of the Roman Church as based on a "deistic" theology. He did not deny that the Roman Church held to supernatural intervention in the world, but he believed that she had limited God to operating only through her, and her supernaturalism had devolved into a crass form of superstition. Rome's "deism" was demonstrated in her effective separation from Christ and her assumption of sovereignty over the Church, both doctrinally and governmentally, without that Divine guidance which alone could safeguard her integrity. Against this view which he believed accurately reflected the position of Rome, Jewel, in the tradition of the Continental Reformers, declared his conviction that the Church was God's exclusive property and she was wholly dependent on Him for her preservation. The fact that Rome had become corrupt was evidence that she existed apart from God.

The Apologist was not impressed by the pious affirmations of the Papists that the headship of the



pope over the Church did not conflict with the Lordship of Christ, since the papacy was conceived of as God's instrument for properly governing His Church.<sup>1</sup> Such a delegation of authority was impossible, the Bishop held, for no mere man could ever hope to take place of the Lord Himself. The Reformer conceded that Christ worked in His Church through His ministers, yet this was made effective only by His Spirit working both in these leaders and in the hearts of the people who were all members of the one Body of Christ under His direct Lordship. It was in this way that Christ was present in the Church to lead and to supply life. On account of this indwelling Spirit in the hearts of His people the entire Church would never fall into apostacy, though parts, and even at times the vast majority of her supposed members might become heretical and hence apart from the true Church.

Rome's claim to infallibility on matters involving faith and morals was, to Jewel's mind, a blas-

---

1. Harding, An answer to maister Juelles challenge in Jewel's Works, I:377-378: ". . . Although the church be first and principally governed by Christ, . . . yet God's high goodness hath so ordained, . . . this government of the church to be committed to one man, which at the first was Peter, and afterward each successor of Peter for his time."



phemous assertion since it in effect, and for all practical purposes, equated the Church of Rome with God, and ignored the teaching of the Scripture and well known historical facts. Moreover, these unwarranted pretensions made the Roman Church an end in herself, and made obedience to her authority the requirement for salvation. Jewel's retort to this position was that God alone was infallible, and His Church existed for Him in order that His people might worship and be edified.

## CHAPTER III

### THE CHURCH AND SCRIPTURE

In a certain sense it was because of Henry VIII's desire for a male heir that a reformation based on the authority of the Bible was precipitated in the Church in England. The King resorted to the Scriptures to justify his marriage to Anne Boleyn, and to disprove the pope's claim to universal sovereignty over the Church. Though the warrant of Scripture was originally sought by Henry in order to enable him to obtain a divorce from Catherine, it was eventually cited as the authority for the Church of England's claim to independency from the Church of Rome. The "Act in the Restraint of Appeals" of 1553,<sup>1</sup> which reminded the world of the antiquity of England's claim to be a free empire, was supplemented in 1554, by recourse to the Scriptures as justification for

---

1. 24 Henry VIII, Cap. 12, in Henry Gee and William Hardy, Documents Illustrative of English Church History (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1896), no. L, pp. 187-195.

for England's freedom from the Roman See. In that year the Convocations of Canterbury and York were asked, in the name of the King: "Whether the Roman Pontiff has any greater jurisdiction bestowed on him by God in the Holy Scriptures in this Realm of England than any other foreign bishop?"<sup>1</sup> The Convocation of Canterbury responded with "noes 34, doubtful 1, ayes 4," while the Convocation of York "unanimously . . . affirmed the conclusion . . . that the Bishop of Rome has not . . . any greater jurisdiction in the kingdom of England,"<sup>2</sup> Similar noteworthy phrases regarding the Holy Scriptures are found in a statute of 1539 in which were mentioned: "Things declared by the Holy Scripture and the Word of God for your and their salvations,"<sup>3</sup> and: "Causes not being contrary or repugnant to the Holy Scriptures and the laws of God."<sup>4</sup> Such affirmations relegated the traditions and common consent of centuries to a subordinate position, and foreshadowed the part the Scriptures were

---

1. Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LVIII, pp. 251-252.

2. Ibid.

3. 25 Henry VIII, Cap. 21, in ibid., No. LIII, p. 225.

4. Ibid., p. 213.

to play in the formation and establishment of the Church of England. In England these attempts on the part of Henry VIII were instrumental in launching the Reformation emphasis on the authority of the Holy Scriptures which ultimately developed into the Elizabethan Settlement of which Bishop Jewel was the apologist.

Under King Henry, both Reformers and civil authorities supported these official assertions, but for quite different reasons. Christopher Morris states, and not unjustifiably: "The Reformers were concerned with religion, the King's party with almost everything other than religion."<sup>1</sup> Despite the honor paid to the Scriptures and the apparent obedience of the Realm to its precepts in ordering the government under the sovereign "according to the Word of God," the Scriptures were a tool used to justify and to implement the King's will. Conversely, in assenting to these Statutes, the Reformers expressed their belief that the Scriptures were not mere instruments to be employed when convenient, but were the criterion against which

---

1. Christopher Morris, Political Thought in England, Tyndale to Hooker (London: Oxford University Press, 1953), p. 48.

the Church, her doctrines and practices, were to be tried. The combination of these two groups, authorities civil and ecclesiastical, united in purpose, but separated in motive, was ultimately disastrous to the Roman cause in England. An Erastian civil government under Edward continued this trend begun in the previous reign, until by the time of the death of the young king, the Reformers had established the legality of a married clergy, instituted the reception of Communion in both kinds by the laity, and attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation--all accomplished as a result of their devotion to the teaching of the Scriptures.

The prominence that the Bible was to have in the Church of England in the reign of Elizabeth was anticipated by an event during Mary Tudor's final illness, and was dramatically demonstrated during the new Queen's Coronation Procession through London on January 14th, 1559.

In a letter dated December 20th, 1558, Edwin Sandys, the future Archbishop of York, reported to Henry Bullinger that Mary had sent two members of her council to Elizabeth to ask her, among other things, to promise that there would be no alterations made in

religion in return for the bequeathal of the royal crown. To this Elizabeth is reported to have replied: "As to religion, I promise thus much, that I will not change it, provided only it can be proved by the word of God, which shall be the only foundation and rule of my religion."<sup>1</sup>

The fourth pageant on Elizabeth's Coronation Procession was composed of two hills: one green and fertile, the other brown and barren. On the green hill sat a colorfully dressed youth, in gay spirits, representing a flourishing kingdom; on the barren hill sat a young man in rough clothing, downcast in spirit, denoting a decaying commonwealth. Between the two hills was a cave from which "Truth" emerged carrying a Bible and led by "Father Time." The meaning of the pageant was explained by a child:

This old man with the scythe, Old Father Time  
they call,  
And his daughter Truth which holdeth yonder Book,  
Whom he out of his rock hath brought forth to us  
all,  
From whence these many years she durst not once  
out look.

The child continued and explained that the Bible was the means whereby the Commonwealth was to be brought

---

1. Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 3-4.



from a state of decay into prosperity. The Bible was then presented to the Queen who graciously received it, kissed it, embraced it, and gave thanks to the City for it.<sup>1</sup> Thus Elizabeth, who was to bear the title of "Supreme Governor" of the Church of England, began her reign with the Scriptures as her support.

The importance of the Bible, both politically and ecclesiastically, in the Elizabethan Settlement cannot be overestimated. The authority of the Scriptures was cited for both the political act of the Royal Supremacy and the ecclesiastical separation from Rome. Among the nine acts of Henry VIII which were revived during the reign of Elizabeth<sup>2</sup> was one concerning

---

1. See Tudor Tracts, introduced by A. F. Pollard (Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co. Ltd., 1903), pp. 381-383.

2. T. M. Lindsay, History of the Reformation in Lands Beyond Germany (Vol. II of The History of the Reformation, 2 Vols; Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907), pp. 393-394: "The Acts of Henry VIII, which were revived were: - 24 Hen. VIII c. 12 - 'The Restraint of Appeals,' passed in 1533; 23 Hen. VIII c. 20 - 'The conditional Restraint of Annates;' 25 Hen. VIII c. 19 - 'The Submission of the Clergy and Restraint of Appeals of 1534;' 25 Hen. VIII c. 20 - 'The Ecclesiastical Appointments Act;' 'The absolute Restraint of Annates, Election of Bishops, and Letters Missive Act of 1534;' 25 Hen. VIII c. 21 - 'Acts forbidding Papal Dispensations and the Payment of Peter's Pence of 1534;' and 28 Hen. VIII c. 16 - 'Act for the Release of such as have obtained pretended Dispensations from the See of Rome.' These

doctors of civil law which contained the following significant declaration:

Most royal majesty is and hath always been, by the Word of God, Supreme Head on earth of the Church of England, and hath full power and authority to correct, punish, and repress all manner of heresies. . . . (His Majesty is) the only and undoubted Supreme Head of the Church of England, and also of Ireland, to whom by Holy Scripture all authority and power is wholly given to hear and determine all manner of causes ecclesiastical.<sup>1</sup>

The higher authority of the Scriptures was the basis and justification for the substitution of the authority of the Crown for the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

In their zeal to suppress error and advance the authority of the Word of God, Jewel and his fellow Anglican Reformers were prone to stress the practical at the expense of the official position of the Scriptures in the Roman Church. Therefore, before a consideration is given to the place of the Scriptures in the Bishop's concept of the Church, a brief digression will be made to review their status in the Roman Church.

The official position of the Bible in the Church

---

Acts are all, save the last mentioned, printed in Gee and Hardy, op. cit., pp. 178-232, 253-56."

1. 37 Henry VIII, Cap. 17 in The Statutes of the Realm (Printed by Command of His Majesty King George III, 1817), Vol. III, p. 1009.

of Rome was high indeed, having always been regarded as of supreme authority, subject to the interpretation of the Church whose exposition became final. The Scripture was received and venerated "as having been dictated either by Christ's own word of mouth or by the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup> The Roman Church had used the Scripture extensively since the beginning of the Christian era, both for liturgical purposes and for doctrinal formulations. Consequently, it was not as much the disuse as it was the misuse of Scripture against which the Reformers spoke. They believed that the Church of Rome had employed the Scriptures more for proof-texts to support ecclesiastical tradition and practice rather than as a touch-stone for theology. The Roman Church asserted her exclusive right, as the authority for, and keeper of the Scriptures, to define its message and apply its teaching. Rome had forced the Scripture into the traditional categories of interpretation: literal, allegorical, mystical, and analogical, and in so doing

---

1. Council of Trent, Session IV, "Decree concerning the Canonical Scriptures" in The Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent, J. Waterworth translator (London: C. Dolman, 1848), Part II, p. 18. Hereafter this work will be cited as Canons and Decrees.

its original sense was frequently lost. The Bible was known and possessed by only a few, and when heard was almost exclusively in Latin--a language unknown except to the educated. Because of the official homage paid to it, and the high esteem in which it was apparently held by the Church, the common man in his ignorance came to believe that there was nothing incompatible between the doctrines and usage of the Roman Church and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures upon which they were supposedly based. Therefore in their return to the Scriptures, the Reformers were not introducing a completely new or novel authority; it

. . . was the way in which this authority was conceived, and the method by which it was to be exercised in the Church, that the significant difference between the reformers and the traditionalists became apparent. The reading of the Scriptures in its literal, historical significance provided both the stimulus to reform and the subsequent justification for what was done.

This chapter is devoted to a consideration of the way in which Jewel answered the following questions regarding the Scriptures: Why were the Scriptures of supreme importance as the basis for the Church, and

---

1. F. J. Taylor, "The Anglican Reformation," in F. W. Dillistone, editor, Scripture and Tradition (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1955), p. 64.

what writings were included in the canon accepted by the Church of England; What were the determinative factors in the proper interpretation of the Scriptures; To what extent was the Anglican Church bound by the Scriptures?

## I. THE SUFFICIENCY OF THE SCRIPTURES

### A. THE SOLE AUTHORITY

It was plain to Jewel that the basic error of the Roman Church was an adherence to a false center of authority which had permitted her to wander further and further from the truth. This had been a gradual development, beginning with an attempt to govern the Church without the Scripture, and resulting in a Church which acted in direct opposition to its teaching. Jewel first mentioned this process in his Challenge Sermon preached at Paul's Cross on November 26th, 1559:

Tertullian, an old father of the church, sheweth us the wilfulness of man's ordinance: "First," saith he, "they attempt somewhat beside the scriptures, to the intent that afterward they may gather courage and boldness to do contrary to the scriptures." At the end they proceed as far as the scribes and Pharisees, that, for maintenance of their own traditions, despised and brake the commandments of God. For redress therein, there



is no better way than to follow St Paul's counsel here, and to have recourse to God's holy word.<sup>1</sup>

The authority of the Church or pope or clergy was a poor and inadequate substitute for the absolute and unerring authority of the Bible. Without the Word of God the Roman Church, Jewel believed, had built on "ignorance" which had been further enhanced by the Church having pulled "the Scriptures out of the people's hands and heads, that no man might see their doings."<sup>2</sup> Thus there was no immovable standard by which to judge the Church or to reform her. The Scriptures, Jewel observed, were as essential to the Church as the North Star was to the mariner:

The master of the ship, when he is on the main sea, casteth his eye always upon the load-star, and so directeth and guideth his ways. Even so must we, which are passengers and strangers in this world, ever settle our eyes to behold the word of God.<sup>3</sup>

Having been blind to this "load-star," the Church of Rome had gone astray and had fallen into error. Lacking

---

1. Jewel, Challenge Sermon, Works, I:24-25; Tertullian, Liber De Praescriptionibus Adversus Haereticos, Caput XXIII in Tertulliani Opera Omnia (Parisiis: J. P. Migne, 1844), Vol. II, Col. 35.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:1001.

3. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1170-1171.



that light which only the Scripture could give she could no longer point the way to truth and faith.<sup>1</sup> The only way in which the Church could remain true, convey truth, and consequently be known as God's Church was through the Word of God. Jewel pointed out that centuries before Chrysostom had said: "He therefore that will know which is the true Church of Christ, how may he know it but by the Scriptures?"<sup>2</sup>

In Jewel's opinion, anything other than the Bible was useless as the supreme authority for the Church, since the Scriptures alone contained the very words of God. The Reformer's doctrine of the Scriptures and their inspiration would probably be inaccurately labeled today as a doctrine of Verbal Inspiration because he believed the words of the Scriptures came directly from God, and when the Bible spoke God Himself spoke. The Bishop found himself lacking words to express his high regard for the Bible:

---

1. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1170-1171.

2. Ibid., 1170; Chrysostomus, Opus Imperfectum in Matthaeum, Hom. xlix, Cap. xxiv, in Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia (Parisiis: D. Bernardi De Montfaucon, Ordis Sancti Benedicti, 1724), Tom. VI, p. cciv.

The Scriptures are the "word of God." What title can there be of greater value? what may be said of them to make them of greater authority, than to say, "the Lord hath spoken them" that "they came not by the will of men, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup>

After speaking of Numa, Minon, and Lycurgus, all kings known for their splendid laws and great worldly wisdom, the Apologist asserted that in fact "they were unwise" because "they had no knowledge or understanding of God."<sup>2</sup> He remarked that their laws were dead and their names forgotten, whereas "the law of God came from heaven indeed; God wrote it with His finger: it is the fountain of all wisdom, and therefore it shall continue for ever and never have an end."<sup>3</sup> The word of God was the "true manna," the "bread from heaven," the "key of the kingdom," the "savour of life unto life," the "power of God unto salvation,"<sup>4</sup> and the bounds of the Church.<sup>5</sup> It was through the Scriptures that God manifested "his might, his wisdom, and his glory," and

---

1. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1163; II Peter 1:21.

2. Jewel, ibid., IV:1164.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:819; Hieronymus, Commentariorum in Michaeam, Lib. 1, Cap. 1 in Opera Omnia (Parisiis; J. P. Migne, 1845), Tom. V, Col. 1162.

supremely "by it he will be known of us,"<sup>1</sup> Through the Scripture Christ exercised His Headship over the Church and expressed His will. In comparison to the Scriptures, the Bishop declared: "All the wisdom of this world is but vain and foolish."<sup>2</sup>

## B. THE AUTHORATIVE BOOKS

It was one thing for Jewel to state that the Scriptures were the sole basis of the English Church; it was another matter to defend the writings which he, and his Church, believed formed this Bible. His opponents required that he state exactly what he meant by "The Holy Scriptures," and to this, on behalf of the Anglican Church, he replied: "We receive and embrace all the canonical scriptures, both of the old and new testament."<sup>3</sup> He thus excluded the books of the Apocrypha

---

1. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1164.

2. Ibid.; cf. John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion, I:viii:1. The text of The Institutes used throughout this Thesis is that edited by John McNeill and translated by Ford L. Battles, Vols. XX and XXI of The Library of Christian Classics (London: S.O.M. Press, Ltd., 1961, 16 Vols.).

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:429; cf. Article VI of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England.

which were accepted by the Roman Church. The reason given by Jewel for the inclusion of the traditional books of the Old and New Testaments and the rejection of the Apocrypha was in accord with his purpose to demonstrate that the Church of England had returned to the primitive simplicity of the Church of the Fathers: "We embrace and reverence every parcel and tittle of the scriptures without exception, not refusing any part thereof that hath been allowed by the ancient and learned catholics of the church of God."<sup>1</sup> In support of this position he cited the words of St. Jerome: "The church readeth the story of Judith, the book of Toby, and the books of the Maccabees, but the same church receiveth not these books as the canonical scriptures."<sup>2</sup> The books of the Apocrypha could only be called "canonical" in the sense that they were allowed to be read in Churches, but only the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were the foundation of the reformed Church of England. Jewel accepted the testimony of the primitive Church regarding the canonical books as support for the position

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:431.

2. Ibid., III:432; Hieronymus, Praefatio in Libros Salomonis in Hieronimi Opera Omnia, Vol. IX, Col. 1241-1244.

taken by the Church of England; he did not seek to justify that position on the basis of any precedent set by the early Church.

In rejecting the Apocrypha, Jewel expressed his Continental Reformed training and bias. No doubt he realized, with his extensive patristic knowledge, that many of the fathers of the Church could be cited in support of the authority and canonicity of many of the books of the Apocrypha.<sup>1</sup> But the Apologist also realized that to include these writings as canonical would be to accept what he and the other Reformers believed to be the result of Roman error and misjudgment; they refused to weaken their position by following this Roman decision.<sup>2</sup>

Another reason for excluding the Apocrypha, perhaps more important than the testimony of the early Church and the anti-Roman feeling, was the knowledge that if the books of the Apocrypha were accepted as canonical, the Church of England would also accept the

---

1. This discussion is pursued in the Defence, Works, III:341-442.

2. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:ix:14; letter of Abp. Parker to Dr. Nicholas Heath of March 26th, 1560, in Parker Correspondence, p. 110; Council of Trent, Session IV, "Decree Concerning the Canonical Scriptures" in Canons and Decrees, pp. 18-19.



source of support for the Roman doctrine of prayer for the dead, its attendant doctrine of purgatory, and the Roman practice of masses for the dead with all its implications.<sup>1</sup> As the Scriptures were final and "alleged in proof of faith," the Apocrypha could not be included in the canon of Holy Scripture.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel categorically denied the validity of the declaration of the Roman Church that Scripture required "tradition" to complete it, and the belief that the Church had authority to determine which writings were canonical and which were not. The Bishop supported the position of the Church of England which asserted that Scripture alone was the sole authority of the Church by demonstrating that the Church of the first five centuries had looked only to the Scriptures for her authority and message. The English Church, like that early Church, had been given the eyes of faith to recognize the inspired writings of Scripture, and together with that primitive Church, had rejected the Apocryphal books which had been accepted by the Church of Rome.

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:431-434; especially II Maccabees 2:39-45.

2. Ibid., III:433.



## II. THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE

### A. HISTORICAL JUSTIFICATION

Jewel believed that since the Scriptures were the word of God, the authority for all Christians and the standard of the Church, it was imperative that they be available to the laity as well as to the clergy. The people had gone astray and were running headlong into destruction, according to the Bishop, because of "very simplicity," for "they (were) . . . not taught," and as a result "they (did) . . . not know God."<sup>1</sup> It was only through the reading of the Scriptures that the people would be able to discern the true from the false.

Jewel cited the ancient Church as an example of the kind of society that would exist when the people were thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures. He urged that Christians follow the practice of the fathers Origen and Chrysostom who exhorted "the people to read the Scriptures, to buy them books, to reason at home betwixt themselves of divine matters; wives with their

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Luke, Works, II:1024. Parentheses mine.

husbands, and parents with their children,"<sup>1</sup> During this early period,

. . . before ignorance crept into the church, and got the upper hand, when the word of God was not counted hard, and dark, and doubtful; when children, and women, and servants, and men of the country, had the knowledge of God, and were able to reason of the works of God . . . they could not easily be deceived, because they had that word which bewrayeth the thief: they carried with them, like good exchangers, the weights and touch-stone, and were able to try coins, whether they were true or false. Such were the people and such was the state of God's church in those days.<sup>2</sup>

The Scriptures had been so well known in the days of the pure primitive Church that Theodoretus had said:

Ye may commonly see that our doctrine is known . . . even of the tailors, and smiths, and weavers, and of all artificers; yea . . . also of women. Ye may find even the very ditchers . . . disputing of the Holy Trinity and the creation of all things.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:795; Origenes in Exodum et Leviticum Homiliae, ix, 5 in Origensis Opera Omnia (Berolini: Haude et Spener, 1839), edidit Carol. Henric. Edward. Lommatsch, Vol. IX, p. 352; Chrysostomus, In Matthaeum, Hom. II, in Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, pp. 29-30.

2. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1187.

3. Ibid., p. 1186; Theodoretus, De Natura Hominis, Serm. V, Graecarum Affectionum Curatio in Theodoretii Operum, Tom. IV, p. 556.

Contrary to this belief and custom of the early Church and the reformed Church of England, it was the contention of the Church of Rome that the Scriptures were too difficult for the common layman to read and understand without the proper interpretation being provided by the Church.<sup>1</sup> Harding defended the position of his Church by observing:

The dangers and hurts which the common people's reading of the scriptures in their own language . . . be great, sundry, and many. . . . First, seeing the poison of heretics doth most infect the common people, and all heretics draw their venom out of the Bible, under pretence of God's word; it is not thought good by these men (of the Roman Church) to let every curious and busy body of the vulgar sort to read and examine the bible in their common language. . . . Again, if heresy spring of wrong understanding, of the scriptures, who shall sooner fall to heresy than the common people, who cannot understand what they read? Verily, it seemeth a thing hard to believe, that the unlearned people should understand that which the best-learned men, with long study and great travail, can scarcely at length attain.<sup>2</sup>

It was sufficient for Harding to note that if several "worthy fathers were deceived in one point or two,"

---

1. Cf. "The Trindentine Profession of Faith" from the Bull of Pius IV, "Injunctum nobis," November, 1564 in Henry Bettenson, editor, Documents of the Christian Church (London: Oxford University Press, 1959), p. 372.

2. Harding, Answer to M. Jewel's Challenge, Works, I:681. Parenthesis mine.

it was inevitable that the common people would be deceived in many, thus justifying the position of the Roman Church.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel rejected this Roman thesis and emphatically declared: "God himself, and all the ancient fathers of the church said otherwise."<sup>2</sup> Quoting from the book of Deuteronomy and from the Psalms, the Bishop demonstrated that it was the very will of God that the common people should read the Scriptures, for, despite what the Roman Church said, the Word of God was not dark, but light.<sup>3</sup> It was not the Scriptures, but it was human knowledge which was dark and uncertain. The Reformer affirmed:

Philosophy is dark: astrology is dark; and geometry is dark. . . . The knowledge of these things is hard, it is uncertain: few are able to reach it: it is not fit for every man to understand it.<sup>4</sup>

The Apologist believed that the Scriptures were clear to those who read them with the eyes of faith.

---

1. Jewel, Reply to M. Harding's Answer, Works, II:683.

2. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV:1183.

3. Ibid.; Deuteronomy 30:11-14; Psalm 19:8, 119:105.

4. Jewel, loc. cit.

Although the Reformer refused to accept Harding's allegations that the Scriptures were so difficult and incomprehensible that they should be denied the people, nevertheless he admitted that there were some portions of the Bible which were hard to understand. Yet, in accord with the position of the Church of England as stated in Article VI of the XXXIX Articles of Religion, he affirmed that the central message of salvation was so clear that in spite of the troublesome passages, even those who could not understand all which they read could profit from their study.<sup>1</sup> The harder portions of Scripture were beneficial in that they caused men to be "more diligent in reading, more desirous to understand, more fervent in prayer, more willing to ask the judgment of others, and to presume the less of (their) . . . own judgment."<sup>2</sup> As Gregory had said: "The hardness which is in the word of God is very profitable."<sup>3</sup>

This prohibition of the Roman Church was, for Jewel, merely another indication of the ignorance and

---

1. Jewel, Reply to M. Harding's Answer, Works, I:327.

2. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1183-1184.

3. Ibid.; Sancti Gregorii, Ezechilem, Lib. I, Hom. vi in Opera Omnia (Parisiis: Sumptibus Claudii Rigaud, 1705), Tom. I, Col. 1213.

darkness which had fallen on that Church, and a reflection of her decayed state. The belief that the Scriptures were too difficult, and hence ought not to be read by any except the learned and interpreted only by the Church, was no reflection on the Word of God, but rather on the Roman Church; the Bishop noted: "The howlet seeth not the brightness of the sun, not because the sun-beams are dark, but for that his eyes are weak, and cannot abide so clear light."<sup>1</sup>

Yet Jewel believed that a mere knowledge of the words of Scripture was not sufficient, because it was a slavish devotion to the literal words of the Bible which had led Arians and other heretics into unorthodox beliefs, and had led the Church of Rome to support such an unreasonable doctrine as transubstantiation.<sup>2</sup> He recognized that the question between the Protestants and the Roman Catholics, on the matter of Scripture, was "not of the letters or syllables of Christ's words, for," he conceded, "they are known and

---

1. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV: 1184.

2. Jewel, Reply to M. Harding's Answer, Works, II:563.



confessed of either party." The differences rested in "the sense and meaning of his words."<sup>1</sup> This belief in the sense of the Word of God as "the very pith and substance of the Scriptures," led him to state:

We may not take the letter in all places of the scripture as it lieth. The scriptures stand not in the reading, but in the understanding. Jerome saith: "The gospel is not in the words of the scripture, nor in the outward shew, nor in the leaves; but in the meaning, in the marrow, and in the root, which are hid, and not open and manifest."<sup>2</sup>

#### B. THEOLOGICAL JUSTIFICATION

In answering the question regarding the Scripture as the basis for a true Church of Christ and the necessity for its availability to every man, more serious and significant problems were raised. Since human reason could not be trusted, and philosophy was "dark," how could the words of the Scripture be rightly interpreted and the sense determined, and where did the layman receive his authority and wisdom to interpret and understand these holy writings? The Reformer resolved

---

1. Jewel, Reply to M. Harding's Answer, Works, I:447.

2. Jewel, Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1112; Hieronymus, Commentariourm in Epistolam ad Galatas, Lib. I, Cap. 1 in Hieronimi Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, Col. 386, p. 322.

this problem through his doctrine of the work of the Holy Spirit. It was Jewel's position that just as the Scriptures were written by the Spirit of God, "they (must) be expounded by the same. For without that Spirit," he continued,

we have neither ears to hear, nor eyes to see, It is the Spirit that openeth, and no man shutteth; the same shutteth, and no man openeth . . . And in respect of this Spirit the prophet Esay saith: "They shall all be taught of God."<sup>1</sup>

The Holy Spirit, the Bishop elaborated,

like a good teacher, applieth himself to the dullness of our wits. He leadeth not us by the unknown places of the earth, nor by the air, nor by the clouds: he astonisheth not our spirit with natural vanities. He writeth his law in our hearts: he teacheth us to know him, and his Christ . . . Chrysostom saith: "Therefore hath the grace of the Holy Spirit disposed and tempered them so, that publican, and fishers, and tent-makers, shepherds and the apostles, and simple men, and unlearned, might be saved by these books that of the simpler sort might make excuse by the hardness of them"<sup>2</sup>

It was the Holy Spirit Who could enable individuals to understand and interpret the Scriptures, not an infallible pope or Church, or even the wisdom of wise and

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:234; Isaiah 54:13.

2. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV:1183; Chrysostomus, De Laz. Concio, Hom. iii in Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, Tom. I, p. 739.

learned doctors.<sup>1</sup> This Spirit could be the possession of every man since "God hath not bound himself that his spirit should evermore dwell in Rome; but upon the lowly and humble-hearted, that trembleth at the word of God."<sup>2</sup> Jewel was insistent on the superiority of the teaching and prompting of the Holy Spirit over the guidance afforded by the Roman Church. "True it is," the Apologist declared,

flesh and blood is not able to understand the holy will of God without special revelation: therefore Christ gave thanks unto his Father, "for that he had revealed his secrets unto the little ones," and likewise, "opened the hearts of his disciples, that they might understand the scriptures." Without this special help and prompting of God's holy spirit, the word of God is unto the reader, be he never so wise or well-learned, as the vision of a sealed book. But this revelation is not special unto one or two, but general unto all them that be members of Christ and are endued with the Spirit of God.<sup>3</sup>

In claiming the ability of each man to interpret the Scriptures through the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Jewel rejected the time-honored Roman Catholic teaching

---

1. Jewel, Treatise on Holy Scripture, Works, IV:1185.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:234.

3. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:685; Matthew 16:17, 11:25; Luke 24:27, 32.

that only she could expound them rightly. Two questions immediately issued from the Roman Catholic side concerning the Anglican position: What was there that would prevent dissension from occurring because of differences in individual interpretations of the Scriptures; and, if there was no authoritative Church to confirm the infallibility of Scripture, how were the Scriptures known to be true?

It was noted in the previous chapter that Jewel believed Christ to be present in His Church by dwelling in the hearts of those believers who formed this holy society, thus obviating both the pope as vicar of Christ on earth, and a doctrine of transubstantiation. With Christ as Lord of the Church there was need of no other. In like manner Jewel answered each of the fore-going questions by relating them to the work of the Holy Spirit within the context of the Church. This Church, he held, was a society composed of God's elect whom He had called by the Holy Spirit, and in whom and through whom that same Spirit operated. Consequently, the Holy Spirit worked in the Church by His presence in each individual member of that Body. "The holy Scriptures are plain and clear," the Reformer affirmed, "only to the

children of the Holy Ghost,"<sup>1</sup> inasmuch as it was this Spirit Who "bringeth us to the knowledge of the truth."<sup>2</sup> It was evident to Jewel that with the Spirit possessing each member of the Church there could be no dissensions, schisms, or heretical divisions. With the one Spirit operating in the separate members of the one body, that body would function as a unit--each member working in harmony with every other member, and with the Head. Jewel, believing this, could retort to Harding's accusations of discord and strife within the reformed Church: "God be thanked, we agree thoroughly together in the whole substance of the religion of Christ, and altogether with one heart and one spirit do glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup> The same Spirit working within each member brought all into a unity of truth which far surpassed the external unity of the Roman Church.

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:683; Epiphanius, Adv. Haer., Lib. II, Tom. II, XLIII in Epiphani Opera Omnia (Paris: 1622), Vol. I, p. 766.

2. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:934.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:434.



Jewel recognized the truth of Harding's affirmation that it was the Church which had originally determined the canon of Holy Scripture and declared them to be authoritative. But this, the Reformer ventured, had not been a matter of the Church exercising authority to authenticate Scripture; it was a case of the Church, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, recognizing what already was known to be authoritative and true. The early Church had been given "the Spirit of wisdom, whereby to discern the true Scriptures from the false, yet," he hastily continued, "may we not gather hereof, that the authority of the Church is over and above the Scriptures."<sup>1</sup> The Bible did not need the authority of the Church to make it authentic, for it was as evident to any man of faith that the Scriptures were the Word of God as was the fact that the sun was the sun or the moon was the moon.<sup>2</sup> To indicate that this was not a new doctrine, the Reformer quoted Augustine's answer when asked by the Manichaen heretics to prove the authenticity of the apostles' writings: "If you demand

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:442; cf. Article VI of the XXXIX Articles of Religion; Calvin, Institutes, I:iii:1, 4.

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:441.



of us how we know that these be the apostles' writings, we make you this short answer: Even so we know that our writings are of the apostles, as you know that your writings are of the heretic Manichee."<sup>1</sup> Jewel held that the true children of God had been given wisdom to know the Scriptures; as St. Ambrose had pointed out: "There were false prophets, &c. but the people had a grace given to them to discern spirits."<sup>2</sup> The Spirit Who had guided the Church in the selection of the books of the canon also testified to their authenticity and supreme authority in the hearts of Christian men, hence to those with the eyes of faith they were self-authenticating and needed no other authority save the Holy Spirit.

It was this same operation of the Holy Spirit in the ancient fathers of the Church which enabled Jewel to cite them as examples and authorities for

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:441; Augustinus, Contra Faustum Manichaeum, Liber XXXII, Caput XXI in Opera Omnia, Vol. VII, Col. 509.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.; Ambrosius, Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucam, Liber I, 1, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1533.

the reformed Church of England. The hastiest survey of Jewel's works indicates that he made frequent reference to the fathers. Almost one-third of the Index to the Works is devoted to references to the early fathers, reflecting his avowed purpose to "shew it plainly, that God's holy gospel, the ancient bishops, and the primitive church do make on our side."<sup>1</sup> Jewel turned to these men and to this Church because the Holy Spirit had used them in a special way, and under the guidance of that Spirit they had followed the teachings of the Scriptures with unique devotion. The Apologist declared:

The primitive church, which was under the apostles and martyrs, hath evermore been counted the purest of all others without exception . . . The first five-hundred years of the church are worth more than the whole one-thousand that followed.<sup>2</sup>

The ancient fathers were held in high esteem by

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:209.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:192; cf. Calvin, Institutes, I:ii:13.

Jewel, and about them he said: "We despise them not . . . we read their works: we reverence them: we give God thanks for them: we call them the pillars, the lights, the fathers of God's Church."<sup>1</sup> But yet he felt constrained to add:

But thus we say: The same father's opinions and judgments, forasmuch as they are sometimes disagreeable one from another, and sometimes imply contrarieties and contradictions, therefore alone and of themselves, without farther authority and guiding of God's word, are not always sufficient warrants to charge our faith.<sup>2</sup>

No matter how highly the ancient Church and fathers were regarded by Jewel and the Church of England, they were subordinate to the Holy Scriptures, and were "not the truth of God itself, but only the witnesses unto the truth."<sup>3</sup>

By declaring that the Holy Spirit was available to the individual believer enabling him to properly interpret the Scriptures, the Bishop denied the second of the two major Roman assertions regarding

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:233.

2. Ibid., III:239.

3. Ibid., III:227, 176.

the Holy Scriptures: the Roman Church as determiner and guardian of the Scripture alone had the authority to interpret it. The Church, Jewel believed, as a body of Spirit-filled men might assist in interpretation, but the only infallible Interpreter was the Holy Spirit acting in the hearts and minds of God's faithful.

### III. THE APPLICATION OF SCRIPTURE'S TEACHING

It is clear that Jewel regarded the Holy Scriptures as the supreme authority in the life of the individual Christian and in the life of the Church. But he found that to proceed from the doctrine of the absolute authority of Scripture as the basis of the Church to a practical application of that doctrine was to follow a path filled with difficulties. The Reformer was in the awkward position of being thoroughly imbued with the Continental Reformed doctrines which he earnestly desired to see adopted in his Church of England, but he was called upon to defend a Church which in many ways fell short of that desirable Reformed pattern.

Early in Elizabeth's reign it had become apparent that, as her father before her had done, she would be master of her own house--which included the Church of England. She recognized the wisdom of Henry's action in alleging the authority of the Scriptures for his position as head of both temporal and ecclesiastical causes, and had repeated his claims. Although Protestant principles were more firmly established in England under Elizabeth than in her father's time, she was probably no more sincere in these claims than Henry had been. She was prepared to permit the Anglican Church to travel much further along the road to Protestantism, and even to acknowledge those Churches of the Reformation on the Continent as sisters; yet England's independency or her right to manage her own affairs in the best interest of the whole nation was never to be sacrificed. The Queen was the head of a Church dedicated to the abolition of unscriptural practices, but she reserved the right, if not officially then practically, to determine that which the Scripture permitted and that which it forbade.

Jewel realized his Queen's position and her

determination to maintain it. He also realized the reformed Church's dependence on her will and favor; therefore because the Erastian nature of the Elizabethan Settlement made the reformation of the Anglican Church along strict Scriptural lines, as wished by Jewel, difficult, if not impossible, he was forced to temper his approach and make certain distinctions in the application of Scripture in ecclesiastical affairs.

First of all, the Reformer observed, there were certain definite practices which resulted from Scriptural injunction and were thus mandatory and under no circumstances could be altered in any way. Among these he included Communion in both kinds, public celebration of the Lord's Supper, prayer in the vulgar tongue, and an effective application of the doctrine of the headship of Christ over the Church.<sup>1</sup> "Such orders," he declared, "as were commanded by God may not be changed in any case, only because God commanded them: so as God is everlasting, so is his word and commandment everlasting."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:76.

2. Ibid., I:75.



Secondly, Jewel denoted a large number of practices, customs, and doctrines in the Roman Church which were either expressly forbidden by the Scriptures, or were contrary to its spirit and therefore by implication contrary to its letter. These particular points were noted in Jewel's first Challenge Sermon preached at Paul's Cross on November 26th, 1559, amplified in his sermon at the same place on March 17th, 1560, and treated in minute detail in his Reply to Harding, the Apology, and the Defence of the Apology. It was his purpose in these works to show that such practices and doctrines as held by the Church of Rome could not be proved out of any "old catholic doctor, or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church."<sup>1</sup> Though this second distinction made by the Bishop was chiefly a negative approach to his first positive distinction, it was the most real to him.

Between those things which God commanded and those which He prohibited through Scripture was yet a third

---

1. Jewel, Challenge Sermon, Works, I:20.

category which Jewel was compelled to recognize and adopt as another distinction. In this were included those customs and traditions which had been "devised by men for the better training of the people," and which were not contrary to, or forbidden by the Word of God.<sup>1</sup> Numbered among those things in the "permitted" category were such indifferent matters, which could be retained or abolished by the Church without Scriptural Warrant, as the time of day during which the Sacraments could be observed, the dress of women in Church, and the ownership of minister's goods.<sup>2</sup> To this list, originally cited in May of 1560, in his controversy with Dr. Cole, Jewel, through his brief conflict with the Puritans, found it necessary to add to this third category such significant items as the dress of ministers and the organization of the clergy.<sup>3</sup>

The way in which Jewel applied the Scripture

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:75.

2. Ibid.; cf. "The Sacrament of Orders," Institution of a Christian Man in Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825), pp. 112-115.

3. See below, pp. 273-287.

to certain practices within the Church of England was similar to the position held by Luther. The German Reformer retained much from the Roman Church on the basis that such practices had the support of tradition and were not contrary to the Scriptures. Luther defended the custom of infant baptism on the grounds that it had come to him by tradition and he was "persuaded by no word of Scripture that it was wrong."<sup>1</sup> Likewise, he advocated private confession as a "highly satisfactory practice," though, he added, "it cannot be proved from Scripture."<sup>2</sup>

Yet while Jewel and Luther presented somewhat parallel views, they did so for different reasons. The German Reformer was convinced that much from the Roman Church was good, and when properly used could be of benefit to the Church even though Scriptural warrant was lacking. Jewel supported certain practices which had

---

1. Luther, "Concerning Rebaptism" in Church and Ministry (Vol. 40 of Luther's Works, Helmut Lehmann general editor. 55 vols.; Philadelphia: The Muhlenberg Press, 1954), edited by Conrad Bergendoff, p. 254.

2. Luther, The Pagan Servitude of the Church in The Reformation Writings of Martin Luther (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1952), trans. Bertram Lee Woolf, p. 285.

no foundation in the Scriptures because, by the command of the Queen, they were to be adhered to in the Church of England; he recognized that to fail to uphold such practices would result in undermining the whole structure of the reformed English Church and would threaten her unity.

#### IV. SUMMARY

The Scriptures were for Jewel a practical answer to the question: If the Church is not infallible, then where can an absolute authority for religious truth be found?<sup>1</sup> This question was necessitated by the rejection on the part of the Church of England of Roman supremacy and its concomitant doctrines and traditions. Centuries of tradition had impressed upon the mind of Western Christendom that although the Scriptures were of supreme authority, they could only be interpreted by the Church, infallibly. Eventually this led to the not-surprising or illogical assumption that the Church too was of ultimate authority since she had both

---

1. See Repert E. Davies, The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers: A Study in Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin (London: The Epworth Press, 1946), pp. 9-13.

determined the canon of Scripture and was its inerrant expositor. By the time of the Reformation, the emphasis on authority had shifted from the Scriptures to the Church.

Jewel reacted to this substitution which had resulted in the toleration and perpetuation of innumerable corruptions and heresies by returning to the Scriptures as the supreme authority for the Church and her people. It was clear to him that "it is possible that the church may err; but it is not possible that the scriptures may err."<sup>1</sup> The only way of reforming the Church was by an application of the Word of God, because "like as the errors of the clock be revealed by the constant course of the sun, even so the errors of the church are revealed by the everlasting and infallible word of God."<sup>2</sup> An inerrant Scripture had replaced an infallible pope and Church.

Yet Jewel was not so naive as to believe that by so exchanging one for the other the problem of the relation between the Scripture and the Church had been

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:79.

2. Ibid., I:80

resolved. He was not faced with the problem of succeeding divines of having to defend the Bible as the authoritative Word of God because this was almost universally believed throughout Christendom in the sixteenth century. His first problem was to specify exactly what was meant by the Scriptures since the Reformers had rejected the authority of the Apocrypha and had retained the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments. The Church of England had been guided by the Holy Spirit to assume this position, Jewel asserted, just as centuries before the Spirit had guided the early Church and the fathers to the same decision. Jewel believed that the testimony of the Spirit had not been limited to a particular time, i.e., the time of the primitive Church, nor to a particular Church, i.e., the Church of Rome, but was an active force in the hearts of individual believers who could depend on His assistance in interpreting and utilizing the Word of God. It was in this sense that the Church, as a body of Spirit-possessed men, could assist in interpretation; the Church was not an organization made infallible by the unique possession of this Spirit.

Jewel was not unmindful of the difficulty which



obtained through the rejection of the authority of the pope as head of the Church, together with the doctrine of infallibility and the submission of the Church to the absolute Lordship of Jesus Christ through the Scriptures. The exercise of the Roman Pontiff's authority was unambiguous and efficient. His words were audible and his decisions and decrees were presented in such detail that there could be no question of intention or interpretation, and, though methods of travel and communication presented some difficulties, papal documents containing the will of the Vicar of Christ found their way into all parts of Western Christendom.

The doctrine of the Headship of Christ over the Church through the Word of God, as Jewel presented it, was, by its nature, less practical than that of the Romanists. The Scriptures, which contained the words of God, were the means by which Christ made known His will and executed His office as Lord of the Church. To the believer these words were known as God's through their infallible Interpreter, the Spirit, who possessed and governed every man of faith. Only by possessing and knowing the Scriptures could the Christian therefore know and apply God's will, and thus fully experience the rule of Christ in his life. The avail-

ability of the Bible to every person was consequently indispensable if the Church of England was to be ruled by her Lord.

Jewel was a sincere Reformer who was interested in returning the Church of England to the purity of the early Church through following the precepts of the Holy Scripture. Conversely, his Queen was chiefly interested in unifying the Realm, and often resorted to the Scriptures to support her government in its independent policy toward Rome. At times these two attitudes resulted in the same solution of a problem, e.g., the rejection of Papal power in England; at other times they conflicted, as in the case of the controversy over the cross in the Queen's Chapel and the wearing of ecclesiastical vestments. Therefore Jewel's treatment of the Scriptures in relation to the Church, in the name of unity, was tempered to a large extent by the political situation under which he labored.

In the Reformer's mind the Church was under strict obligation to follow the commandments of God in the Scriptures when they were explicit. Where the beliefs and traditions of the Church were in opposition to the letter and spirit of the Scriptures then she was required to reform her life and bring it under obedience

to the Word of God. But where the Scriptures were silent, and practice, hallowed by its origin in godly men, had proven from the early days of the Church to be for the edification of God's people, then such customs should be retained, for there was no good cause to abandon them.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE CHURCH AND DIVINE ELECTION

The message of the rediscovered Scriptures witnessed to the surety of the re-found faith of the Church of England. In reading Jewel's writings one gets the definite impression that the author is completely convinced of what he is saying and the position which he is defending. Although the Bishop would readily admit that the Church of England was not perfect, and indeed confessed in several of his letters that the Reformation in England was not proceeding as well as he wished it,<sup>1</sup> in his public utterances he gave the impression of one who was the spokesman for that Church which was as near the early Church of Christ as it was possible for any Church to be. The reason for this attitude of certainty was not so much that the Church of England had found the truth of God, but that the truth of God had found her, called her, and led her

---

1. See letters to Martyr: Nov. 16th, 1559, Works, IV:1225-1226; Feb. 4th, 1560, ibid., IV:1229-1230; to Abp. Parker: Dec. 22nd, 1565, ibid., IV:1265.

from error. It was Jewel's contention that the Anglican Church as a part of the Church catholic, which could never be totally identified with any visible institution, was in direct continuity with God's people of all ages, and had been elected of God, brought into existence by His Spirit, and was utterly dependent on Divine grace for her life.

### I. GOD'S FAITHFUL PEOPLE

Jewel repeatedly pointed out to his opponents, that in spite of what they said, the reformed Church of England was not a new creation. She had, he insisted, returned to the purity and spirituality of primitive Christianity from which Rome had departed many centuries before. Yet the Reformer did not believe that the Church of God had begun in the first century of the Christian era as a completely new entity. The Church of the New Testament was a continuation of that Church which had always existed as long as God's faithful men and women had lived. The Bishop said, when speaking of the times before Christ:

For even in those days there was the very same God that is now, the same Spirit, the same Christ, the same faith, the same doctrine, the same hope, the same inheritance, the same covenant, and the

same efficacy and virtue of God's word: Eusebius also saith: "All the faithful, even from Adam until Christ were indeed very Christians," though they were not so termed.<sup>1</sup>

Still speaking of the Church in pre-Christian times he stated:

The patriarchs, the prophets, and the holy men in old time, had the same testament, . . . the same prayer, the same sacraments that we have; forasmuch as they drank of Christ as we do; forasmuch as they were circumcised, and so are we; forasmuch as they did believe that they should be saved by the death of Christ, as we do.<sup>2</sup>

In calling attention to this unity, Jewel did not mean to imply that there was no difference between the Church before and after Christ. He agreed that Chrysostom's comparison of "the state of the Jews unto a candle; and the state of Christians to the brightness of the sun,"<sup>3</sup> was an excellent illustration of the relation of the pre-Christian Church to the New

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:725; Eusebius, Ecclesiasticae Historiae, (Cantabrigiae: Typis Academicis, 1720), Liber I, Caput IV, p. 11.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Luke 10:23, 24, Works, II:1078; cf. Calvin, Institutes, II:x; Heinrich Bullinger, Decades, edited for the Parker Society by T. Harding (Cambridge: The University Press, 1849-1852), Vol. III, Sermon X, pp. 401-403.

3. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:615; Chrysostomus, Homilia LX, Caput xxxvi in Genes., in Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, Tom IV, pp. 581-582.



Testament Church.<sup>1</sup> He also cited, with approval, Irenaus' comparison of the "Jews to the sowing of the seed; and the Christians to the harvest and reaping of the corn," and concluded by recalling St. Paul's comparison of the Jews to a child and Christians to "a full perfit man."<sup>2</sup> The Church was treated as a unity--one body of God's own people from Adam to the present, having reached her fullness in Christ.

God's "Israel" was His, not through the wisdom of those within this Church having come to Him of their own accord, but because of His grace, mercy, and effectual calling. Jewel followed the tradition of Augustine and Calvin in believing that man did not as much will to be in the Church as God willed him to be in her. Even as God had called one nation, Israel, to be His own people for His own purpose, so He continued to call men into His new Israel: the Church. It was with this feeling of such a definite calling that Jewel could speak with conviction about the reformed Church of England. In commenting on II Thessalonians 2:13 he observed that his readers had been chosen of

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:615; Irenaus, Contra Haereses, Liber IV, Caput XXV in Sancti Irenaei Opera (Parisii: Joannis Baptistae Coignard, 1710), p. 261; Galatians 4:1-2, I Corinthians 13:11.

God from the beginning; "His election is sure forever."<sup>1</sup> God had called them, and the tokens of that call were both seen and felt "through sanctification and the faith of truth."<sup>2</sup> The Reformer did not discuss the doctrine of election in relation to the Church in his works as systematically as did Calvin, but it was nonetheless a thread of thought which ran through all discussions in vindication of the policies, practices, and doctrines of the Church of England.<sup>3</sup>

As the Holy Spirit was present in the Church by His presence in believers' hearts; as He led to a knowledge that the Scriptures were the Word of God and interpreted them to the sincere seeker; He also witnessed to the elect of the certainty of their calling. With St. Paul the Bishop declared: "This Spirit beareth

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:933.

2. Ibid., II:934.

3. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:1:3; Luther, Of The Christian Church in The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther, Henry Bell translator, Joseph Kerby revisor and corrector (London: Sussex Press, 1818), p. 231; Bullinger, Decades, Vol. V, Sermon I, pp. 7, 17; Vol. IV, Sermon IV, p. 187; Huldreich Zwingli, Reckoning of the Faith of Huldreich Zwingli to the Roman Emperor Charles, in Samuel M. Jackson, Huldreich Zwingli the Reformer of German Switzerland (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1901), p. 463.

witness unto our spirit, that we are the sons of God,"<sup>1</sup> Because of this indwelling Spirit, those whom God had called "could not be deceived with the power of the antichrist;" they would not "fall from grace" neither would they perish.<sup>2</sup> That the Church of England had come to the knowledge of the heresy of the Church of Rome was evidence of her election. Jewel affirmed that even the corrupt Roman Church could be used of God to assist the chosen:

This is the comfort which abideth with the faithful, when they behold the fall of the wicked; when they see them forsake the truth, and delight in fables; . . . When we see these things in others, we must say: "Alas, they are examples for me, and they are lamentable examples! Let him that standeth take heed that he fall not. But God hath loved me, and hath chosen me to salvation. His mercy shall guide my feet, and stay me from falling. He hath loved me, he hath chosen me, he will keep me."<sup>3</sup>

With this inner testimony of the Holy Spirit the Anglican Church felt herself called of God just as the Children of Israel had been called in previous generations.

The Reformer held that God's effective call into

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:934;  
Romans 8:16.

2. Ibid., II:933.

3. Ibid.

membership in the Church was necessitated by man's inability to seek after God. Man did not, of himself, or could not, believe the Gospel, for the Bishop asserted: "The belief of the gospel is laid upon our hearts by the Spirit of God."<sup>1</sup> Nor could men come to a knowledge of the truth by his own efforts, since it was God alone Who "bringeth us to a knowledge of the truth."<sup>2</sup> This work of the Holy Spirit within man was required, according to the Apologist, because unaided man was incapable of any good or godly act. His will had been so affected by sin that it was evil and enslaved. With Augustine Jewel described man's unregenerate will as "wounded, . . . mangled, . . . troubled, . . . lost."<sup>3</sup> In addition the Reformer declared:

We also say, that every person is born in sin, and leadeth his life in sin; that nobody is able truly to say his heart is clean; that the most righteous person is but an unprofitable servant; that the law of God is perfect, and requireth of us per-

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:934.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:168; Augustinus, De Natura et Gratia, Caput LIII, 62, in Opera Omnia, Vol. X, Col. 277.

fect and full obedience; that we are able by no means to fulfil that law in this worldly life; that there is no mortal creature which can be justified by his own deserts in God's sight.<sup>1</sup>

Those good things possessed and accomplished by men, said Jewel again in the words of Augustine, we have "of God," while "of ourselves we have nothing, only the sin that is within us."<sup>2</sup> Once more citing Augustine Jewel affirmed:

We will; but it is God that worketh in us to will. We work; but it is God that worketh in us to work, according to his good pleasure. This is behoveful for us both to believe and to speak. This is a godly, this is a true doctrine, that our confession may be humble and lowly, and that God may have the whole.<sup>3</sup>

God's will that man should be in His Church was made efficacious by His Spirit working within man to bring him to faith, and thereby into the fellowship of the Church.<sup>4</sup>

Since faith, which was the gift of God to His

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:65-66.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:168; Augustinus, Sermon CLXXVI, Caput VI, in Opera Omnia, Vol. X, col. 953.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.; Augustinus, Liber de dono Perseverantiae, Caput XIII, 33, in loc. cit., Vol. X, Col. 1012-1013.

4. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, III:ii:35; Bullinger, Decades, Volume II, Sermon VIII, pp. 363-369



elect given on His own initiative, and not outward works, rites, or ceremonies, was the basis for membership in the Church of Christ, the constituency of this mystical body could be known only to God. This society, seen by God alone, was consequently the "invisible," the "conjectural," the "true" Church.<sup>1</sup> It is to Jewel's concern about this Church and her external manifestations that we now turn.

## II. THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE

Jewel recognized two aspects of the Church: one visible, the other invisible. Though he and the Continental Reformers firmly believed in the invisible Church and the implications of this doctrine, they did not think exclusively in terms of this feature of the Church. Indeed, their main concern was with the visible Church--the Church in which the Word of God was preached and the Sacraments administered--the Church which Calvin said "we are commanded to revere and keep communion."<sup>2</sup> These men believed that a proper under-

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:668.

2. Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:7. Although Calvin has rightly been thought to be one of the chief Reformed



standing and appreciation of a doctrine of the invisible Church was indispensable to the erection of a firm basis for the Church visible. It was their chief desire that this visible Church, in which and through which they worked, be as pure and as spiritual as it was able to be, and therefore to approximate the Church invisible as nearly as possible.

The visible Church was defined by the Reformer as "the whole body and company of all them that be called Christians, reckoned universally together."<sup>1</sup>

---

exponents of the doctrine of an invisible Church, only a very small portion of Book IV of the Institutes, which is devoted wholly to a treatment of the Church, is given to a consideration of the Church invisible. John T. McNeill states that "throughout (Book IV), the church is treated as the divine institution to assemble and minister to the elect in the earthly condition in which they are," and claims that the entire fourth Book of the Institutes can be outlined in the following sentence of Calvin: "Accordingly, our plan of instruction now requires us to discuss the church, its government, orders, and power; then the sacraments; and lastly, the civil order." John T. McNeill, editor, Institutes, Vol. II (Vol. XXI of The Library of Christian Classics), p. 1012, note no. 2. Calvin, as well as Jewel, though affirming a belief in the invisible Church as the true Church, was principally interested in the outward visible Church.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:668.

In this external Church were those who to all outward appearances were of the elect, and therefore of Christ's Church. Yet because even "they that seem predestinate before men are oftentimes wicked, and reprobate before God; and they that before men seem the members of Christ are oftentimes before God the members of antichrist;"<sup>1</sup> this visible body was not identical to the true Church of Christ. Jewel used Cardinal Cusa's description of the Church to explain his own position:

In this sensible world that is here beneath we must learn by sensible tokens to know the very church of Christ; for otherwise we are not able to reach the truth. Therefore this conjectural church in this sensible world, according to such a short knowledge as this world may yield, is indeed the true church; notwithstanding, according to the conjecture that we gather by tokens, it receiveth as well the godly that be joined to Christ, as also the ungodly that be divided from Christ. This church standeth of them that declare by sensible and outward tokens that they be partakers of Christ, as they be that confess Christ to be the Son of God. And therefore this church hath certain holy tokens, or sacraments, . . . ordained to that end, that thereby we may know them that be of Christ, so far forth as by such tokens conjectural knowledge may be gathered.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:668; cf. Zwingli, Reckoning of the Faith in Jackson, Huldreich Zwingli, p. 464.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.; Nicolai De Cusa, Epistola Prima ad Rodericum de Treuino (anno 1442, dii 20, maii), in Nicolai De Cusa Cardinalis Opera (Basileae; 1565), Tomus II., p. 826.

The Bishop concluded this formal consideration of the invisible Church with the comment: "Thus the general or outward church of God is visible, and may be seen; but the very true church of God's elect is invisible, and cannot be discerned by man, but is only known to God alone."<sup>1</sup>

H. F. Woodhouse rightly calls attention to the contradiction which is evident in Jewel's use of these words of Cardinal Cusa.<sup>2</sup> The Cardinal was apparently calling attention to the fact that within the Church were to be found both the righteous and the unrighteous; hence this Church of truth could be known by men only through "conjecture." This "conjectural knowledge" was gathered by the outward signs of the Sacraments. Although Jewel did not explain just how Cusa's words were relevant to his position, it is probable that the Reformer merely intended to point out to Harding that a Roman Catholic writer of some note had indicated that

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:668; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:4, 7-9; Bullinger, Decades, Volume I Sermon I, p. 8; Zwingli, Reckoning of the Faith, in Jackson, Huldreich Zwingli, p. 463.

2. H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology 1547-1603 (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 53.

the true Church could never be seen or known by men, for within that institutional Church were those who, although Christians by outward profession, were yet not of the faith. Jewel's concluding statement at the end of his quotation from Cusa was therefore a summary of what he believed the gist of Cusa's words to be.

Jewel's belief in the invisible Church as the true Church of Christ was largely a result of his attitude toward the Roman Church as it had been constituted during the preceding millennium. In the Apology he defended Luther and Zwingli as "being most excellent men, even sent of God to give light to the whole world."<sup>1</sup> This naturally caused Harding to respond with the question:

Was the light extinguished in all Israel till that lowd friar came, and Zuinglius the swart rutter? Shall we now change the old song of Micheas the prophet, "Out of Sion shall come the law, and the word of our Lord from Jerusalem;" and sing a new song, Out of Wittenberg is come the gospel, and the word of the Lord from Zurich and Geneva? . . . If Luther and Zuinglius first came to the knowledge and preaching of the gospel, what meant Christ to break his promise, who said, "I will be with you all the days till the end of the world?"<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:666.

2. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:666.

Jewel's reply to Harding was that this promise of Christ was given, not to the visible Church of Rome,<sup>1</sup> but to the true, invisible catholic Church of Christ throughout the world, and this promise had been kept even though the Roman Church had erred.

In stating that true light had come into the world through Luther and Zwingli, the Bishop expressed his conviction that from the end of the sixth century until the Reformation, the Church of Rome had been in darkness, error, and heresy. Had there then been no Church in the West for a period of almost a thousand years? If the Roman Catholic Church was coterminous with the true Church, Jewel's answer to that question would necessarily have been that the true Church had ceased to exist. If the Church was conceived as an institution of salvation wherein the gospel was presented and the sacraments administered for the purpose of offering salvation, then by Jewel's definition, there had been no Church in the West for a thousand years. The Roman Church, he held, had left the gospel, misinterpreted and misadministered the Sacraments, and as a result no

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:667.



salvation had been offered by her. But this sort of institution was not the Reformer's concept of the Church.

The Bishop explained that the situation which had obtained in the Roman Church from the sixth century was comparable to the situation which had existed in the Kingdom of Israel in the days of Elijah the Prophet:

Elias thought all the godly in Israel had been slain, and not one left alive; but God said to him, "I have saved unto myself seven thousand men, that never bowed their knee before Baal." God knew them; but Elias knew them not. To the judgment of man they were invisible.<sup>1</sup>

The true Israel of the spirit had existed in the days of Elijah as a remnant within the nation of Israel which had rebelled against God. Even so, in the latter days the true Church had existed as a remnant of God's people within the heretical Roman Church. Augustine was quoted again in support of Jewel's position: "According to God's secret predestination, there be many

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:667; I Kings 19:18. Jewel also likened the Church to the moon "which sometimes is full and round, and bright, and glorious, sometimes is wholly shadowed and drowned in darkness; and notwithstanding is not consumed, but in substance remaineth still." Defence, Works, IV:724.



sheep without the church, and many wolves within the church; for he knoweth them and hath them marked, that know neither themselves, nor God neither."<sup>1</sup> The faith, Jewel affirmed, had not been completely obscured in those days of faithlessness "for even in the midst of that thick mist of darkness God" willed "that there should be some, who, though they gave not a clear and bright light, yet should kindle were it but some spark, which men being in the darkness might espy."<sup>2</sup>

The true Church, as the new Israel, was made of God's chosen people who exercised their God-given faith within the Church. Whereas membership in the Church in popular Roman thought was achieved by an outward profession and conformation to external rites; according to Jewel membership in the Church of faith resulted from the Spirit's gift of inward grace and true belief in Christ. He declared: "The very true Church of God's elect is invisible, and cannot be discerned by men, but is only known to God alone,"<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:667; Augustinus, Joannis Evangelium, Tractatus XLV, 12, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Col. 1725.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:730.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:668.

since only He could know a person's heart and faith. Because there were "many sheep without the church and many wolves within the church," the institutional Church which men could see was not to be equated with the invisible Church which was God's creation and which He alone could comprehend.

Jewel's emphasis on the invisible Church did not mean that he thought the visible Church to be unnecessary or unimportant. He made clear his belief that since the Church was God's and was composed of His elect no man could ever presume to know, of a certainty, where the true Church of Christ began and ended, much less determine the requirements for entrance. The Reformer did not present two distinct Churches, but presented the concept that the invisible Body of Christ could never totally be identified with the visible, organized Church.

### III. THE DOCTRINE OF THE INVISIBLE CHURCH IN HISTORY

Many modern Anglican theologians are reluctant to admit that the Church of England ever thought in terms of an invisible Church for they feel that this doctrine was typical of the Continental Reformers who

broke the continuity of the Catholic Church. In support of their position they cite Article XIX of the XXXIX Articles of Religion which affirms that

The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

In commenting on this Article, Leonard Hodgson indicates that two different interpretations are possible. In one

. . . the use of the words "visible" and "invisible" implies that the Article takes for granted the doctrines of the invisible Church. Its concern is with the visible Church, but it defines it in a way which shows that it presupposes the invisible.<sup>1</sup>

According to the other interpretation

. . . the significant thing about the Article, when compared with contemporary Reformation literature is its omission of any reference to the invisible Church. The opening words when taken in conjunction with the title ("Of the Church"), imply that there is only one Church, the visible.<sup>2</sup>

H. Burn-Murdoch is typical of those Anglican theologians who, following the Tractarians of

---

1. Leonard Hodgson, "The Church of England" in The Nature of the Church, Nelson Flew, editor (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1952), pp. 132-133.

2. Ibid., parenthesis mine.

the nineteenth century, support this latter interpretation. In speaking about the various changes which resulted from the Reformation, he refers to, among others, "a novel theory of an invisible Church in the world which Ulrich Zwingli seems to have been the first to expound."<sup>1</sup> In attributing the origin of this concept to Zwingli, Burn-Murdoch seems to have forgotten the position taken by such men as St. Augustine, William Ockham, and John Wyclif. The doctrine of a Church visible and invisible was not new in the time of the Reformation, though it remained to the Reformers of the sixteenth century for its development.

Augustine was the first to propose the basic idea of what developed into the doctrine of the invisible Church. This father of the Church was concerned about two groups of people within the Church: those apparently of faith, and those evidently not of faith. Of this situation Augustine said:

It is therefore possible that some who have been baptized without may be considered, through the foreknowledge of God, to have been really baptized

---

<sup>1</sup> H. Burn-Murdoch, Church, Continuity and Unity (Cambridge: The University Press, 1945), p. 155.

within, because within the water begins to be profitable to them unto salvation . . . and again, some who seem to have been baptized within may be considered, through the same foreknowledge of God, more truly to have been baptized without, since by making bad use of baptism, they die by water . . . Certainly it is clear that, when we speak of within and without in relation to the Church, it is the position of the heart that we must consider, not that of the body, since all who are within in heart are saved in the unity of the ark through the same water, through which all who are in heart without, whether they also are in body without or not, die as enemies of unity.<sup>1</sup>

Since the attitude of the heart must be of primary consideration in any discussion about the membership of the Church, only God could know who is truly in His Church, since He alone can know the heart as it is.

Augustine's doctrine of a group of God's faithful people within the visible Church was required, as was Jewel's, by his doctrine of the divine election. For Augustine "salvation is a sheer miracle wrought by God's inscrutable will on behalf of a part of ruined mankind and is no way congruent with human action or ability."<sup>2</sup> God elected certain individuals according

---

1. Augustine, "On Baptism, Against the Donatists," Book V, Chapter 39, in Writings in Connection with the Donatist Controversy, translated by J. R. King (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872), p. 148.

2. Albert C. Outler, "The Person and Work of Christ," in A Companion to the Study of St. Augustine, Roy



to His will, and these elect formed the true Church. As Augustine expressed it: "In that unspeakable foreknowledge of God, many who seem to be without (the Church) are in reality within, and many who seem to be within yet really are without,"<sup>1</sup>

Although Augustine pre-dated the Reformers by a thousand years, his concern, resulting from this conflict with the Donatists, was the same as that which caused the Reformers to develop their doctrine of the two aspects of the Church. In commenting on Augustine's position, F. W. Dillistone observes:

He recognized first the central core of those within the Catholic Church who were either already spiritual or were making progress with earnestness of heart toward that end: these certainly belonged to the true house of God. Then there were those within the Catholic Church whose conduct was a constant affliction to the hearts of the saints and whose character was so perverse that they could be regarded only as vessels of dishonor doomed to final destruction: they could not be regarded as belonging to the "substance" of the house of God, though formally they were to be found within it. . . . Though he approaches the question in a variety of ways, Augustine never attempts to give a final test whereby those

---

Battenhouse editor (New York: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 360.

1. Augustine, "On Baptism," Book V, Chapter 38 in Writings in Connection with the Donatist Controversy, p. 147; cf. Augustine, The City of God, Book I, Chapter 35, translated by Demetrius Zema and Gerald Walsh (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1950), pp. 71-72.



who are the chaff within the Church may be separated from those who are grain without the Church. The final judgment is in God's hands.<sup>1</sup>

As St. Augustine's doctrine of the true Church within the outward Church was largely the result of his controversy with the Donatists, so Wyclif's belief in a Church within a Church resulted from his concern over the conflict in the Western Church as a consequence of the Great Schism. Wyclif believed that the true Church of Christ could not be identified with either the Church of Urban VI or Clement VII. He was so affected by the proceedings of the two Popes, that on moral and religious grounds he divorced himself from the papacy, claiming that the pope and cardinals might be the heads of a Church in Rome or Avignon, but the true Church was the body of God's elect of the past, present, and the future, whose Head was not a pope, but Christ.

The Church in Wyclif's mind was fundamentally a spiritual unity, not dependent on outward conformity to ceremonies or necessarily known by external signs, but was "moder to eche man that shal be saved, and con-teyneth no membre only men that shulen be saved."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. F. W. Dillistone, "The Anti-Donatist Writings," in Battenson, A Companion, pp. 190-191.

2. John Wyclif, "Of the Church and Her Members" in

This Church was not defined in terms of the clergy:

Whanne men speken of holy Chirche, thei understonden  
annon prepatis and prestis, monkis, and chanouns,  
and freris, and alle men that han crownes through  
thei lyven nevere so cursedly agenst Goddis lawe,  
and clepen not no holden seculeris men of holy  
churche, though thei lyven nevere so trewely after  
Goddis lawe, and ended in perfect charite. But  
netheles alle that schullen be savyed in blisse  
of hevene ben membris of holy Chirche, and ne  
moo,<sup>1</sup>

He acknowledged that the Church in her widest sense, from an earthly point of view, included all those who had outwardly professed their faith in Christ and adhered to the outward practices of the Church. But the true Church was founded on God's election and was a body which only God could know.

The Babylonian Captivity of the Church (1309-1377) in Avignon and the subsequent Great Schism (1378-1417) led to a re-evaluation of the papal supremacy over the Church, and consequently to a reconsideration of the

---

Three Treatises by John Wycklyffe D.D., James H. Todd, editor (Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1851), p. iv. Cf. Joannis Wiclif Trialogus, Gotthardus Lechler, editor (Oxonti: E. Tyrogaapheo Clarendoniano, 1869), Liber IV, Caput 22: "Vere dicitur ecclesia corpus Christi mysticum, quod verbis praedestinationis aeternis est cum Christo sponso ecclesiae copulatum." pp. 324-325.

1. John Wyclif, "Octo in quibus seducuntur simplices Christiani," in Wyclif's Select English Works, Thomas Arnold, editor (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1871), Vol. III, p. 447.

Church's very nature. This period of over one hundred years produced many great minds. Like Wyclif, such men as Marsiglio of Padua (c. 1275-1342), Dietrich of Neim (c. 1340-1418), and William of Ockham (c. 1300-c. 1349) were vitally interested in a reformation of the Church, but unlike Wyclif who sought reformation by placing the Scriptures in the place of supreme authority, these conciliarists sought reform through institutional and constitutional methods. Yet though their methods and ultimate goals might differ from those of Wyclif, they arrived at a similar view of the Church of Christ, i.e., a body of faithful believers whose status as a Church was not dependent on a relationship to an external institution.<sup>1</sup>

The above-mentioned Conciliarists did not employ the concept of an invisible Church as it came to be expounded by the sixteenth century Reformers, but rather differentiated between the Church universal and her external institutional organization. Dietrich of Niem drew a distinction between "the one holy Catholic" Church and the "Apostolic" Church,<sup>2</sup> which, according to

---

1. See Ewart Lewis, Medieval Political Ideas (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954), Vol. II, pp. 377-378.

2. Dietrich of Niem, Ways of Uniting and Reforming

J. T. McNeill, was essentially an affirmation of "the concept of the invisible church of all the elect . . ."1

For Niem, the Catholic Church was the universal Church,

. . . made up of various members of Greeks, Latins, and barbarians who believe in Christ, of men and women, of peasants and nobles, of poor and rich, constituting one body, which is called Catholic. The head of this body, the Universal Church is Christ alone.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand he believed the Apostolic Church was the

. . . particular and private Church. It is included in the Catholic Church, and is made up of the pope, the cardinals, the bishops, the prelates, and the churchmen. It is usually called the Roman Church, whose head is believed to be the pope . . . This Church may err, and may have erred, may deceive and be deceived . . . and may even fail.<sup>3</sup>

---

the Church in Advocates of Reform, edited by Matthew Spinka (Vol. XIV of The Library of Christian Classics, London: SCM Press, 1953), pp. 150-151.

1. John T. McNeill, editor, Calvin's Institutes (Vols. XX and XXI of The Library of Christian Classics), Vol. II, p. 1022, note no. 14,

2. Dietrich of Niem, Ways of Uniting and Reforming the Church in Advocates of Reform, pp. 150-151.

3. Ibid., p. 151.

Ockham, in arguing that "every people and every community and every body which can made law for itself without the consent or authority of anyone else can . . . elect certain persons to represent the whole community or body," described the universal Church as "all the faithful . . . one body, as Paul says in Romans 12:(5), 'We, being many, are one body in Christ'; and they are one people and one community."<sup>1</sup> "Occam's conception of the church minimized the distinction between the laity and the clergy. . . . (he) sharply distinguished between the external, institutionalized church and the church as the totality of believers."<sup>2</sup>

The concept of the Church as held by these two conciliarists approximates Augustine's, Wyclif's, and Jewel's idea of a spiritual, universal, or "invisible" Church. In this Catholic Church, "and in its faith," according to Dietrich of Neim, "every man can be saved, even if in the whole world a pope cannot be found . . . In this Church all the faithful, in so far as they are

---

1. William of Ockham, Dialogus, Part I, Book 6, Chapter 84 in Ewart Lewis, Medieval Political Ideas, Vol. II, p. 400.

2. Ewart Lewis, ibid., p. 550.



faithful, are one in Christ, in whose faith there is no differentiation between Jew and Greek, master and slave."<sup>1</sup> This Church needed no pope or clergy: she "cannot be divided by schism, because she can even be preserved in one individual."<sup>2</sup>

Calvin's view of the Church was typical of the attitude of the Continental Reformers. The visible Church for him was "the whole multitude of men spread over the earth who profess to worship one God and Christ," but he added, "in this church are mingled many hypocrites who have nothing of Christ but the name and outward appearance."<sup>3</sup> The invisible Church, conversely, was "that which is actually in God's presence, into which no persons are received but those who are children of God by grace of adoption and true members of Christ by sanctification of the Holy Spirit."<sup>4</sup> This

---

1. Dietrich of Neim, Ways of Uniting and Reforming the Church in Advocates of Reform, p. 151.

2. Ibid., p. 153.

3. Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:7.

4. Ibid.



Church included "not only the saints presently living on earth, but all the elect from the beginning of the world."<sup>1</sup> Even though the external Church might be corrupt and ineffectual, "God," Calvin affirmed, "miraculously keeps his church as in hiding places."<sup>2</sup>

Because of the historical situation in which Augustine, Wyclif, Dietrich of Niem, Calvin, and Jewel lived, and the ecclesiastical corruption and heresy against which they rebelled, it was their common desire in acknowledging the visible and invisible aspects of the Church, to explain by some method, how the Church of Christ could at the same time be His mystical, spiritual Body on earth, and still harbor those who apparently were not of the true faith. None of them wished to depreciate in any way the value or reality of the outward institutional Church; they rather sought to strengthen her by noting that no matter how corrupt she might become, she was still God's Church, and even though her external unity and continuity was interrupted

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:7; cf. The Augsburg Confession, Articles VII and VIII; Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, pp. 5-9.

2. Calvin, op. cit., IV:i:2.

by heresy and schism, the spiritual unity maintained through God's elect people always guaranteed the existence of the true Church, though invisible to human preception.

It is not uncommon for contemporary Anglican theologians to disparage the concept of an invisible Church. Leicester Lewis, noting the historical situations in which such views have flourished, believes that such an idea "has generally be the expression of discouragement and frustration in efforts to reform the Church. With the failure of such efforts in regard to the Visible Church an escape was developed by the thought of an Invisible Church,"<sup>1</sup> B. M. H. Thompson observed that because the Continental Reformers abandoned the "fundamental principle of external continuity," it was only natural that a doctrine of an invisible Church, consistent with this "theory," was adopted by them. But she stated on the other hand: "To those who believe, as

---

1. Leicester C. Lewis, "The Anglican Church" in The Nature of the Church, Nelson Flew, editor, p. 311. It is interesting to note that after making this statement, Lewis continues in the next paragraph: "The Church is not co-terminous with the Elect. There may be many good people who are not members of the Church, as unquestionably there are many bad people who are members."

the framers of the Anglican religious settlement did, in the Visible Church as an historic reality," the idea of an invisible Church was completely foreign.<sup>1</sup> She explained:

We are not concerned here with the theology of the Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; we are concerned rather with their conception of the Church--their insistence upon the Visible Church, . . . as against Protestant insistence upon the invisible Church as a body of unseen and unknown believers.<sup>2</sup>

To such minds as are represented by Lewis and Thompson, the Church can best be authenticated by its external continuity with the ancient Church of Christ and the apostles. A theory of the visible Church supports this line of thought, while the concept of a spiritual, invisible Church composed of God's elect chosen people seems to belittle the institutional Church and negate the historic efforts of the Church to maintain its unity and continuity.

But to accuse Jewel and the other "framers of the Anglican religious settlement" of rejecting or ignoring

---

1. B. M. H. Thompson, "The Post-Reformation Episcopate in England" in The Apostolic Ministry, K.E. Kirk, editor, p. 398.

2. Ibid., p. 421.

the "Protestant" idea of the invisible Church is to misread history, overlook obvious facts, and read into their works a position which the majority did not hold.<sup>1</sup> Jewel and his Anglican contemporaries had sufficient experience with a Church which gloried in historical continuity and externals to realize that, though a visible manifestation of the Church was inevitable and desirable for practical purposes, it was only an expression of a more basic spiritual and mystical continuity with Christ and all men of faith.

It must not be thought, however, that all contemporary Anglican theologians would take this attitude toward the teaching of the sixteenth century Reformers. In summarizing their own belief regarding the relation between the visible and the invisible Church, the authors of The Fulness of Christ, a report presented to the

---

1. See Cranmer, "An Answer to Smith's Preface" in On the Lord's Supper, edited for the Parker Society by John E. Cox (Cambridge: The University Press, 1844), p. 377; Philpot, "Thirteenth Examination," in Examinations and Writings, edited for the Parker Society by Robert Eden (Cambridge: The University Press, 1842), p. 136; Hooper, "A Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith," Articles 47, 48, 49 in Later Works, edited for the Parker Society by Charles Nevinson (Cambridge: The University Press, 1852), pp. 40-41; Field, Of The Church, Book I, Chapter 7 (Cambridge: The University Press, 1847), Vol. I, p. 26.

Archbishop of Canterbury in 1949, present a statement that concisely conveys, not only their own position, but one with which Jewel would have agreed as well. After claiming that "the Church in its deepest sense is the community of the elect or of those who have saving faith in Christ,"<sup>1</sup> the authors proceed to state that because of this definition of the Church, it is necessary to draw a "distinction between the 'outward and visible' aspect of the Church's life and the 'inward and spiritual' aspect as well."<sup>2</sup> Contrary to those modern Anglicans who have been quoted in this chapter, these men assert that

. . . the doctrine of the invisible or mystical Church is not a denial of the crucial importance of the outward and institutional element of the Church's life; it is an assertion that important though the outward may be, it is meaningless apart from the inward, that there is no salvation apart from personal faith in Christ, and that acceptance of outward membership of the Church does not infallibly guarantee the existence of such faith.<sup>3</sup>

Jewel would have readily agreed with this Committee

---

1. The Fulness of Christ, S. F. Allison et al (London: SPCK, 1960), p. 30.

2. Ibid., p. 31

3. Ibid.



in their declaration that a distinction made between a "visible" and an "invisible" Church was not an

. . . assertion of two different Churches, one seen of men, one only known to God. It is an assertion that the one Church has two aspects; that it is in essence a personal fellowship of men with and in Christ, and that the outward institution is the necessary vehicle and embodiment of that fellowship. The visible Church of Christ is therefore defined in terms of its true nature as the vehicle and embodiment (albeit an imperfect embodiment) <sup>1</sup> of the unity created by this personal fellowship.

#### IV. SUMMARY

Jewel's doctrine of the Church and her relation to divine election is at one and the same time a reaction against the Roman stress on the Church as a visible institution, and a product of his belief in the nature of God and the sinfulness of man.

The Church of Rome had led people to believe that it was only through membership in that Church headed by the pope that salvation could be obtained. Had this been true, Jewel believed, salvation would ultimately be the result of man's endeavor and wisdom since it was his decision whether or not to take the step of membership and obedience. Rome had devised elaborate rituals

---

1. The Fulness of Christ, p. 31; parenthesis in text.



and ceremonies, of which the Mass was the most conspicuous and obnoxious to the Reformer, and had forced various external observances on her people so that by adhering to these rites God would be pleased. In effect, Jewel believed, salvation in the Roman Church had become a matter of works.

The Bishop was convinced that Roman doctrine and custom was in direct opposition to the teaching of Scripture, the ancient Church, and the fathers. Man was a sinful creature who had no natural inclination toward God, but on the contrary, rebelled at every opportunity. Faith was not a native possession of man, nor could it be fostered by man's unaided will; it could only come as a gift from God. Some men, the Bishop acknowledged, received this gift--others did not. The Apologist made no effort to explain this position or to elaborate this doctrine of election; he was content to quote Augustine at length--indeed to the extent that the words of the Father made up the majority of what Jewel wrote on the subject.

This faith which men received incorporated the believer into the Body of Christ--His Church. Jewel would have agreed with P. T. Forsyth when that modern theologian affirmed: "To be a Christian . . . is to enter

Christ; and to enter Christ is in the same act to enter the Church which is in Christ."<sup>1</sup> Because this faith could only be received, and this response made to God through the working of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of those whom God had chosen, it was possible for some to be outside the fellowship of the visible institutional Church and yet be of that society of faithful men which was the true Church; it was also equally possible for there to be many who were members of the visible Church who had not been given this gift of faith.

Since God alone could accurately discern the hearts of men, those who were of faith could only be known of Him. This group, the Reformer declared, formed the true Church which was invisible to human eyes because of the very nature of the requirements for membership. God called these elect people into fellowship with one another, and thus a visible Church was created. Yet this visible institution was never coterminous with the Church of the faithful. At times the true Church was but a small minority in the external organization; at other times the godless were in the minority.

---

1. Peter Tayler Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments (London: Independent Press, 1947), p. 43.

This emphasis on Jewel's part was in no way an attempt to escape from the problems which plagued the visible institution. It was rather an omnipresent challenge, for it was his intention to have the Church visible in England coincide as nearly as possible to the Church invisible.

## CHAPTER V

### THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

The rediscovery of the Church as fundamentally a society of people called by God through faith into the Body of Christ involved implications which naturally led the Reformers, on each side of the Channel, to a re-evaluation of the ministry within the Church. The two-classed society in the Roman Church of lay and clergy, which had been a slow but steady development from the early days of the Church and which finally dominated the life of the Medieval Church, was almost completely abandoned by the great Reformation Churches, and the doctrines of priesthood and ministry reinterpreted in the light of the Holy Scriptures. This re-evaluation and reinterpretation was necessitated because the Roman Church's belief in the difference in kind between the laity and the ordained clergy and the doctrine of the episcopate as an essential order on which the Church was dependent, was incompatible with the Reformed doctrine of the Church as a society of God's elect under the

lordship of Christ exercised through the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit.

When Jewel approached the doctrine of the ministry within the Church he was immediately confronted with a problem. If he affirmed that the ministry, as defined by the Roman Church, was necessary for the "esse" of the Church he would be in danger of falling into the Roman Catholic error of defining the Church in terms of the clergy. Yet if he affirmed that the ministry was not necessary in the Church he would associate himself, and the Church he sought to defend, with the Anabaptists and other radicals whom he denounced with vehemence.<sup>1</sup> In order not to fall into error, either on the left or on the right, he found it necessary to make certain distinctions which determined his doctrine of the ministry. Basing his doctrine on the derivative nature of the ministry from the work and ministry of Christ, he (1) distinguished between the ministry and the work of the ministry, concluding that it was the latter which was essential for the life of the Church. He also (2) drew a distinction between the power of the Word of God and the authority of the ministry which

---

1. See below, pp. 260-263.

proclaimed it and upon which the ministry depended. Finally, and almost incidentally he (3) defended the retention of the ancient threefold ministry as being the most useful for the Anglican Church. It is with these concepts that this chapter is concerned.

## I. THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY

### A. THE MINISTRY DERIVED

Jewel's view of the ministry of the Church began with his prior concept of the mission and work of Christ. It was only because of Christ, he believed, that the Church existed, and any consideration of the work in and of that Church had to begin with the One Who was her Head and Sovereign.<sup>1</sup> Before the time of Christ God's message to men had been proclaimed by the patriarchs and prophets. God had so spoken through these men whom He had called that the prophets could sign "their speech thus: 'The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it;' 'The Lord hath said;' 'The voice and the word of the Lord;' 'Hear the word of the Lord'."<sup>2</sup> "But," the Bishop

---

1. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:iii:2; Luther, "On Christian Liberty," in First Principles of the Reformation of Dr. Martin Luther, edited by Wace and Buchheim (London: 1883), p. 106.

2. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129.



continued:

when the fulness of time came, God sent his Son, and hath spoken unto us by him. He became our prophet, to shew us the will of his father. He saith: "I have not spoken of myself; but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment, What I should say, and what I should speak."<sup>1</sup>

God's Word which had previously been proclaimed by the patriarchs and prophets had been supremely declared by His Son, Jesus Christ.

After Christ's ascension the world had not been left without that office of the preaching of God's Word, for God, Jewel asserted, "appointed that the comfort (of His message) . . . should be carried into all nations, and gave that charge to his apostles: 'Go teach all nations'."<sup>2</sup> This commission, originally given by Jesus to the apostles, had, according to the Apologist, been given equally to those successors of the apostles who now comprised the ministry of the Church. The ministry to which these men had been "ordained"<sup>3</sup> was that of "fishers of men."<sup>4</sup> As the

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129; John 12:49.

2. Jewel, loc. cit. Parenthesis mine.

3. Jewel here did not use the word "ordain" in its technical sense of being set apart by the laying on of hands, but in the sense of being called.

4. Jewel, op. cit. II:1130.

patriarchs and prophets had been called, so the ministry of the Church had been commissioned to "call the people to repentance, and to preach the kingdom of God,"<sup>1</sup> The ministry of the Church of England was therefore an extension of the ministry of Christ and the apostles through the preaching of God's Word, and was to be esteemed highly, "seeing our Saviour was not ashamed to publish the will of his Father in his own person."<sup>2</sup>

#### B. ORDINATION NOT A SACRAMENT

This ministry to which God called men was described by Jewel as being both "holy" and "heavenly"<sup>3</sup> because the One Who was the source of the ministry and

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1130.

2. Ibid., II:1129. As Jewel based the prophetic ministry of the clergy of the Church of England on the prophetic ministry of Christ, so many high-churchmen today claim that "the dignity of the priest comes from his union with the priestly work of his crucified Master." Edward R. Hardy, "Priestly Ministries in the Modern Church," in The Ministry in Historical Perspective, H. Richard Niebuhr and Daniel Day Williams, editors (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956), p. 151.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.; cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon III, p. 102; Zwingli, Hulderich Zwinglis Samtliche Werke in Corpus Reformatorum (Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1905), Vol. IV, p. 425, hereafter cited as Werke.

Whose Word was the message of the ministry, was holy, not because the individual called by God was thus made, in some supernatural way, different or holy. The work of the ministry was holy since it was God Who acted through the men He had called to this office.<sup>1</sup> The Bishop's high estimation of this office was reflected in the way he believed God worked through the ministry, for, he stated: "By such as have this office, God lighteneth our darkness, he declareth his mind to us, he gathereth together his scattered sheep, and publisheth unto the world the glad tidings of salvation."<sup>2</sup> The holy ministry, having been entrusted with the commission to preach the Gospel, held the salvation of men in its hands, and Jewel believed that pastors, since they represented the person of Christ in their ministry, should so "reverently do their office, that all men may perceive that it is a heavenly business which they have taken upon them"<sup>3</sup> Indeed, God so used the ministry, Jewel affirmed, that His very image shown through His

---

1. Cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon III, p. 102; Calvin, Institutes, IV:1:506.

2. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129.

3. Jewel, A Learned and Godly Sermon, Works, II:961.

ministers.<sup>1</sup>

Whereas Jewel believed that the ministry was holy because of the holy nature of its work, the Roman Church believed its holiness was derived from its sacramental character and its close association with the other Sacraments of the Church, especially the Sacrament of Holy Communion.<sup>2</sup> Ordination was one of the Seven Sacraments held by the Church of Rome, and just as grace was conferred in the other six Sacraments, so it was conferred to the recipient of Holy Orders. According to St. Thomas Aquinas, the Sacrament of Order was particularly directed to the Eucharist, and differed from

---

1. Jewel, A Learned and Godly Sermon, Works, II:961.

2. Canons and Decrees, Session XXIII, Chapter III, p. 172: "Whereas, by the testimony of Scripture, by Apostolic tradition, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers, it is clear that grace is conferred by the sacred ordination . . . No one ought to doubt that Order is truly and properly one of the Seven sacraments of holy Church." The Council of Trent also stated that Order imprinted an indelible character on the recipient (Session XXIII, Chapter IV in ibid., p. 172), gave the Holy Ghost to the ordained (Session XXIII, Chapter IV, Canon IV in ibid., p. 174), and gave the power to consecrate and offer the true body and blood of the Lord in addition to the power to forgive and to retain sins. (Session XXIII, Chapter IV, Canon I in ibid., p. 173).

the other Sacraments in that they were administered in order that certain graces might be received, while the Sacrament of Order was administered so that certain acts might be performed.<sup>1</sup> The Council of Trent closely identified the priesthood with the Eucharistic observance:

Sacrifice and priesthood, are, by the ordinance of God, in such wise conjoined, as that both have existed in every law . . . and the sacred Scriptures show . . . that this priesthood was instituted by the same Lord our Saviour, and that to the apostles, and their successors in the priesthood, was the power delivered of consecrating, offering, and administering His Body and Blood, as also of forgiving and retaining sins.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel absolutely rejected the concept that Order was a Sacrament since those things necessary for a true Sacrament were absent from Ordination,<sup>3</sup> and denounced the Roman belief that the clergy were uniquely holy because of their association with the Mass and the doctrine of

---

1. St. Thomas Aquinas, The "Summa Theologica" of St Thomas Aquinas, translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (London: Burns Oates and Washburn Ltd., 1911), Part II, Supplement, Question 37, Article 2, pp. 48-50; Question 39, Article 4, pp. 57-58; Question 40, Article 5, pp. 68-69, Vol. 19.

2. Canons and Decrees, Session XXIII, Chapter I, pp. 170-171.

3. See below, pp. 307-309, 312-313.



the Sacrifice of the Eucharist, about which more will be said in a later chapter. The Reformer declared:

This ministry of the Church was not ordained to offer sacrifice for forgiveness of sins . . . All others whatsoever, apostles, prophets, teachers and pastors, are not in the office to offer propitiatory sacrifice, but are called to the ministry of the saints to the edification of the body of Christ, and to the repairing of the Church of God.<sup>1</sup>

Rather than offering the body and blood of Christ to the people, Jewel made it clear that the function of the ministry of the Anglican Church was to offer the words and message of Christ, open the will of God, and speak in His Name.<sup>2</sup> The ministry of the Church was holy and heavenly, but it was made so through the message it had been commissioned to proclaim, not through any grace or power inherent in the ordained clergy.

#### B. WORK OF THE MINISTRY NECESSARY AND OF FIRST IMPORTANCE

This ministry, according to Jewel, was not only

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II.1131; cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon III, p. 93; Luther, The Babylonish Captivity in First Principles of the Reformation, p. 233; Zwingli, Werke, Vol. II, p. 285.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:380.



made holy by the message and mission entrusted to it; this commission also made the ministry essential to the life of the Church. His high concept of the ministry was in large measure the result of his high opinion of the office of preaching the Gospel, for he believed when the minister spoke, it was not man "but God that speaketh; as Christ telleth the apostles: ' it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you' ".<sup>1</sup> These "prophets and apostles and holy men of God," continued the Bishop,

were but instruments. It was God which gave his holy Spirit, which gave them tongues to speak, and words to utter . . . , though men be but simple, yet the word they deliver is mighty: though they be mortal, the word of the Lord endureth for ever.<sup>2</sup>

The proclamation of this Word was absolutely necessary, for upon its proper presentation depended the salvation of men. This Word, conveyed by means of the ministry, was

. . . mighty in operation: it cleanseth the inner man: it openeth the conscience: it is the savour of life unto life: it is the means of salvation. He that receiveth this word, and believeth, shall

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1130; Matthew 10:20.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.

be saved. This is the word of reconciliation.  
God hath committed it unto us.<sup>1</sup>

It was therefore Jewel's belief that it was not the ministry itself which was essential for the "esse" of the Church, but the work of the ministry through the preaching of the Word of God which both established and was the end of that office.<sup>2</sup> The ministry was considered to be the channel through which the life-giving waters of the Gospel flowed.

It is clear that Jewel substituted the preaching of the Word of God for the traditional Roman Catholic emphasis on the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass, together with the other sacramental and ceremonial duties of the priesthood, as the ministry's main purpose. It would be unfair to accuse him of placing the preaching of the Word in opposition to the administration of the Sacraments inasmuch as he regarded all activities of the ministry as parts of its central function of declaring the Gospel.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, it cannot be denied

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1130.

2. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:iii:2; Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon III, p. 93.

3. See below, pp. 333-334.

that the public preaching of the Gospel occupied the dominant place in the Reformer's thought, especially since it was conceived as the major responsibility of the ministry of the Church. He affirmed that the ministry existed for the purpose of the

. . . setting forth of the mystery of our salvation, both by preaching of the word of God, and by the due and reverend ministration of the sacraments. The principalest part of this office is to preach repentence; so that we may ammend our lives, and be converted unto God.<sup>1</sup>

The Church was dependent upon the office of preaching for through

. . . this ministry God hath gathered to himself an acceptable people, and hath brought them to the obedience of the gospel of Christ, and hath turned the hearts of the fathers unto their children, and so made it the foundation of religion.<sup>2</sup>

An example of the importance of preaching in Jewel's doctrine of the ministry is seen in his conviction that it was the preaching of the Gospel upon which the unity of the reformed Church rested. He pointed out that both Rome and Jerusalem had been over-

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1131; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:iv:1-4; Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon IV, p. 141; "The Sacrament of Order" in Institution of a Christian Man in Formularies of Faith, p. 109.

2. Jewel, op. cit., II:1130.

thrown and destroyed because of division and discord resulting in enemies entering and conquering. He likened a divided Church to a ship "in the midst of the waves wherein are people who bore holes through it, or rent up the ribs of the same."<sup>1</sup> In such a situation men paid no heed to counsel and had no concern for the public good. Quoting David, the Bishop stated that a nation could not expect unity unless it was a unity based on religion: "Except the Lord keep the city, they labour in vain, they watch in vain, that are set to defend it."<sup>2</sup> It was the responsibility of the clergy to "stand upon the tower, to cry and give . . . warning that the enemies are coming, to shew . . . beforehand that . . . foes are approaching."<sup>3</sup> Speaking on behalf of the ministry, he continued: "Our part is to declare unto you, that your fight is not against king, nor Caesar, it is not against any prince or power of this world; but against spiritual enemies, against the devil

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Romans, Works, II:1095.

2. Ibid.; Psalm 127:1.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.

and his adherents."<sup>1</sup> It was the preaching of the Word which Jewel believed would unite not only the Church of England, but the whole nation against her foes.

The duties of the ministry were varied, but all centered around preaching and teaching. In addition to presenting the Gospel and dividing the Word of God "without deceit or guile,"<sup>2</sup> the Apologist called upon the clergy of the English Church to

. . . carry the ark of the covenant before their people, . . . to teach, to instruct, to exhort, to comfort, to rebuke in season and out of season, to plant, to weed, to graff, to shird, to hold up their hands and to pray for the people, . . . to establish them and comfort them touching their faith.<sup>3</sup>

These tasks were to be taken seriously by those whom God had called to the office of the holy ministry, and special care was urged upon the clergy to see that they did not fall into the evil ways of their Roman predecessors. Pluralism was especially singled out as offensive and not in keeping with the calling of the Anglican clergy to serve and not to derive

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Romans, Works, II:1095.

2. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:837.

3. Ibid., II:843-844.

financial benefit from their office.<sup>1</sup>

#### D. THE CARE OF THE MINISTRY

Since the ministry of the teaching of the Word was the extension of the work of Christ, it was to be highly valued, and its rewards commensurate with its responsibility. There were those who claimed that "counsellors, bishops, preachers, and all other sorts of learned men neither plough nor sow . . . they sit at rest and live idly."<sup>2</sup> To such accusations the Bishop retorted: "St Paul calleth the office of a bishop a 'good work'."<sup>3</sup> He maintained that the cares and burdens of those in places of pastoral leadership "pass all other cares in the world," adding:

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Joshua, Works, II:984. Bullinger too, who was a close friend of Jewel and a favorite of the sixteenth century Anglican theologians, was outspoken on the subject of pluralities: "Some one, either soldier or curtisan, often times rakes to himself, . . . half a dozen benefices or more; of which benefices they take no further care, but to receive the gain. For he never preacheth; nay, he is very seldom at his flock, unless it be when he sheareth them." Decades, Volume V, Sermon IV, p. 144.

2. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:941.

3. Ibid.; I Timothy 3:1.



If a bishop or minister study the scriptures, preach the gospel, catechize the children and take a care of the souls of God's people; if he sow the Lord's field, feed the Lord's flock, thresh the Lord's corn, and walk before the people carefully; if he have the care of the churches, . . . he shall find himself occupied, and not be idle.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's high regard for the ministry is seen in in his condemnation both of those who thought so little of the holy profession that they entered it not to serve Jesus Christ, "but their belly,"<sup>2</sup> and those of the laity who held the ministry in such low esteem that they thought all "ministers in the church should teach freely, without hope of recompense, or hire for their labour."<sup>3</sup> The ministry was of such great value that it required constant care from both the clergy and laity, for if adequate attention was not paid to it, "young men which are toward and learned,"<sup>4</sup> who might have considered the ministry as a vocation, would turn from it as a work not worthwhile undertaking, and the

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:941-942.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Psalm 69:19, Works, II:1012.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

Bishop prophesied that if such would happen: "Posterity shall rue that ever such fathers went before them"<sup>1</sup>

If the Church of England was to continue to minister in order that the people might not fall back into ignorance and darkness, the work of that office should not be despised by any man taking his responsibility too lightly, and Jewel called upon all, especially the Queen, to remember "the patrimony due unto them that should attend in the Lord's house."<sup>2</sup>

The Church's need for a well trained clergy was a problem which the Reformer felt most keenly since, as opposed to the Church of Rome, the ministry of the Anglican Church was principally one of teaching and preaching, the effectiveness of which depended, humanly speaking, not on ordination, but on adequate education. In his controversy with Harding, Jewel found it necessary to excuse and, in a sense, defend the ignorance of many of the English clergy, observing that it was not logic, learning, or philosophy by which men were saved, but rather by faith. The Bishop declared that it was the

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Psalm 69:19, Works, II:1013.

2. Ibid., II:1015; see below, pp. 434-437.

message which the ministry had been commissioned to convey which was important, and the effectiveness of this message did not depend on the education possessed by the proclaimer. Jewel explained:

Even in worldly affairs, when the king sendeth forth his proclamations, the courier or persuivant is oftentimes a man of small account, and sometimes so base that he never knew his own father or grandfather. But they that receive the proclamation have no regard unto him that brought it; notwithstanding, in respect of the king's letter that he brought, they yield him honour, and with silence and reverence give attendance to the proclamation.<sup>1</sup>

But when speaking to his fellow Anglicans, Jewel was much more realistic and to the point:

There lack already ministers throughout the realm to teach the people, and to build up the walls of God's church. . . . View your universities: view your schools, which ever have been nurseries to this purpose: alas! how many shall you find in both the universities, and in all the schools throughout England, not only that are already ripe, but also that are minded to the ministry? If they be not found there, alas! where think you to have them? . . . If there be none to be found, . . . be you well assured that the acts of parliament and proclamations are not enough to content the conscience of the people, and to build up the temple.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:911; Chrysostomus, Gen. Homilia XLIV in Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia, Tom. IV, p. 447.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:999.

The kind of society which Jewel envisioned for the Church of England was dependent on a ministry which was well learned, especially in the Holy Scriptures. The key to the whole situation Jewel believed was in the hands of Elizabeth:

O that the queen's majesty knew the great scarcity and miserable need of ministers that is abroad! And I beseech you, good my lords, and other honourable and worshipful that are here, that have or may have access unto her, to put her in remembrance, that her grace will be mindful of the house of God, and redress the greediness both of corrupt patrons, and of such who engross and gather into their hands many livings, being themselves the remnant of the ignorant and persecuting Babylon; and yet leave, to take charge over the people, blind sir Johns, not only lack-Latin, but lack-honesty, and lack-conscience, and lack-religion. It would be a great furtherance to the church of God, a wonderful way to increase schools and universities.<sup>1</sup>

If the people were not to fall back into the ignorance and superstition which had existed under the Church of Rome, a clergy, educated and devoted to truth and the Gospel, alone could provide the necessary leadership.

## II. THE AUTHORITY OF THE KEYS

### A. THE KEYS ARE THE GOSPEL

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:1000.

The office of the ministry, as it was held in the Anglican Church, was an office not without authority since through being charged with the preaching of the Gospel the ministry had also been entrusted with the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Jewel declared: "Moreover, we say that Christ hath given to his ministers power to bind, to loose, to open, to shut."<sup>1</sup> But once again, though Jewel's affirmation was the same as that made by the Romanists, his meaning was far different.<sup>2</sup> For the Reformer, the "Keys of the Kingdom," the "Gospel," the "Word of God," and the "power to bind and loose" were synonymous. He believed:

The office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the minister should either offer by the preaching of the gospel the merits of Christ and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent them pronouncing unto the same a sure and undoubted forgiveness of their sins, and hope of everlasting salvation.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:351.

2. Cf. Council of Trent, Session XIV, Chapter VI, "On the ministry of this Sacrament (Penance), and on Absolution," in Canons and Decrees, p. 100.

3. Jewel, op. cit., III:60; cf. Calvin, Institutes, III:iv:12; Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, p. 44, Sermon IV, pp. 147-149; Zwingli, Werke, Vol. III, pp. 273 ff., Vol. IV, p. 392. This interpretation as expressed by



The Bishop held that it was God alone who could forgive sins,<sup>1</sup> but it was the minister who declared this message of forgiveness through preaching the Gospel. "Sins be forgiven," the Apologist said, "by the word of God, the expounder whereof is the levite or priest."<sup>2</sup> Accordingly therefore, men were not loosed from their sins by the words of absolution through the extraordinary power of a priest, but by receiving the Gospel of Christ.

#### B. THE KEYS COMMITTED TO THE CLERGY

Within the English Church, Jewel declared, the Keys of the Kingdom had been granted "only unto the priest, and to none other; and," he added, "to him only we say, 'whatsoever thou bindest in earth shall

---

Jewel was specifically rejected by the Council of Trent: "This holy Synod, . . . condemns the fanciful interpretations of those who, in opposition to the institution of the sacrament, falsely wrest those words to the power of the preaching of the word of God, and of announcing the gospel of Christ." Session XIV, Chapter I in Canons and Decrees, p. 93; cf. Luther, "The Keys" in Church and Ministry, pp. 321 ff.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:380.

2. Jewel, ibid., III:358; Ambrosius, De Cain et Able, Lib. II, Cap. IV, 15 in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 348. The Council of Trent condemned this proposition as stated by Jewel and other Reformers, stating: "If any



be bound in heaven',<sup>1</sup> It was his position that those holding the office of the ministry could exercise their authority only by fulfilling their call to proclaim the Gospel, which itself had power to release men from sin, to judge their hearts, and to close the Kingdom to non-believers. An example of the way in which Jewel believed the Word worked through the teaching ministry of the Church is his answer to Harding's accusation that since the Anglican Church did not have the Sacrament of Penance and forgiveness of sins by the clergy, the people were still in their sins. To this the Reformer answered, that as a part of God's universal Church:

The Church of England hath Authority this day by God's word to bind and loose, as much as ever Christ gave any of his apostles . . . Our people remain not bound, nor perish in their sins, as these men so uncharitably and fondly have imagined.

---

one saith, that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be forgiven to him who confesses; provided only he believe himself to be absolved . . . let him be anathema." Session XIV, Canon IX, in Canons and Decrees, p. 109.

1. 1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:356. Jewel here quoted from "The Form and Manner of Ordering of Priests" in the Ordinal of 1552. The Bishop did not indicate who "granted" this function, i.e., whether it came from God directly, through the prelates of the Church, or from the community of the faithful.

They be so certain of the remission of their sins in the blood of Christ, as if Christ himself were present and spake it to them. They are taught and know that "the blood of Christ the Son of God hath made us clean from all our sins;" and that "there is no name under heaven whereby we shall be saved, but only the name of Jesus Christ,"<sup>1</sup>

The Church of England made no unusual claims to power for her ministers; but at the same time she declared that they possessed the Keys of the Kingdom since they had been commissioned to preach the Gospel of Christ, and with that "Key" they loosed and bound, opened and shut.

### C. THE TWO KEYS

Jewel believed that the Keys of the Kingdom were two in number--one, the Key of Instruction which worked inwardly in the Christian, and the other the Key of Correction which operated outwardly.<sup>2</sup> These two Keys were not independent and could not be used alone and indiscriminately since they were dependent for their proper exercise on the knowledge of the Scripture possessed by the user. It was only through a knowledge

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:362; 1 John 1:7, Acts 3:12.

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:369.

of the Word of God that a minister could fulfill his teaching and disciplinary responsibility, not having been called to absolve the sinner through private confession, but by public teaching which published the Gospel and opened "the minds of godly persons . . . even as a door is opened with a key."<sup>1</sup>

### 1. CONFESSION

The operation of the Key of Instruction was subjective in nature, working inwardly in the heart of the individual as the Holy Spirit took the Word of God and applied it, through the ministry of the Word, to the person's life. God, the Reformer asserted, was not interested in the outward ceremony of confession and absolution since it was the "life of the penitent which is regarded before God, and not the absolution of the priest."<sup>2</sup>

Yet despite the subjective nature of the Key of

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:365; cf. Defence, Works, III:363.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:380; Hieronymus, Commentariourm in Evangelium Matthaee, Liber III, Caput XVI in Opera Omnia, Tom VI, Col. 118, No. 124, The Council of Trent condemned the proposition that "a new life (is) . . . the best penance." Session XIV, Chapter VIII, in Canons and Decrees, p. 104.

Instruction, Jewel declared that ministers had power to act as judges over sin. After denouncing the Roman practice of private confession before a priest as being ineffective on the grounds that a priest could not adequately discern the hearts of men, he stated that a minister could judge sin properly through the Word of God. But in such cases it was not the minister who judged, but the Word itself; it alone could pierce the heart and conscience and see what reason and human judgment could not. It was the Word of God, and not man, which had been called "the power of God unto salvation, and a two-edged sword" which was "able to judge the thoughts and cogitations of the heart."<sup>1</sup> Thus, he believed, those changes which were wrought in the heart were "wrought not by us (clergy), but by God."<sup>2</sup> The minister, under the Word, had the authority only to apply the judgment of the Gospel to individual cases; he did not have the authority to superimpose his own judgment.

In stating that ministers could act as judges

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:373; Romans 1:16, Hebrews 4:12.

2. Jewel, loc. cit. Parenthesis mine.

over sin the Reformer referred to the spiritual authority of the clergy, explaining that they had no power over the bodies of men since "the weapons of our warfare are not fleshly."<sup>1</sup> He described how in "open crimes and public penance the priest is likewise appointed to be a judge,"<sup>2</sup> which practice was in according with the practice of the primitive Church wherein the penitent

. . . came first unto the bishop and priests, as unto the mouths of the church, and opened unto them the whole burden of his heart. Afterward he was by them brought into the congregation, and there made the same confession openly before his brethren; and further was appointed to make satisfaction by open penance.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:370; II Corinthians 10:4; cf. Institution of a Christian Man in Formularies of Faith, p. 108.

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:373

3. Ibid., III:374. Jewel indicated that heretics were dealt with harshly, i.e., "with lawfull and civil punishments," but he referred not to the authority of the clergy in dealing such punishments, but to the civil authority which enforced ecclesiastical discipline. Apology, Works, III:67. In 1566, during the Queen's visit to Oxford, Jewel was called upon to moderate a disputation in Elizabeth's presence during which the question "Whether the ministry of the Word implied lordship?" was discussed. In concluding the discussion Jewel indicated, when asked, that he "preferred not to enter" on the question, "unless the Queen so commanded." R. W. Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. VI, pp. 141-142.



Jewel did not profess that the Church of England followed this procedure in every detail; its significance for him was the openness of the confession and penance before the whole congregation. It should be noted, though, that following the custom of the early Church, final judgment and sentence was left in the hands of the clergy on the counsel of the elders of the congregation.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. EXCOMMUNICATION

The first of these Keys of the Kingdom, being inward and subjective, worked before God; but the second, being outward and objective worked before men.<sup>2</sup> The second Key had been given to the Church for the purpose of discipline and was exercised by the priest, in his capacity as minister of the Gospel declaring that the Kingdom was closed to "unbelievers and stubborn persons."<sup>3</sup> Jewel believed that it was through instruction that the Kingdom was opened to men, but if men failed to heed the message of the Gospel, the minister then

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:373.

2. Ibid., III:369.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:60.



declared, because of men's refusal, that the Kingdom was already closed to them. The clergy had no warrant to open or to close the Kingdom to men on their own authority, but they possessed an authority, by the Word, to pronounce that opening or closing which had already happened in men's hearts through the operation of the Gospel.<sup>1</sup>

This authority to excommunicate had been delegated to the Church "from above" as a part of the Key of discipline. Jewel thought of excommunication as a loss of fellowship with God's people, especially at the Lord's Table. Because excommunication was the barring of sinners from the Holy Communion, Jewel affirmed: "The Church of Rome, as it hath lost the whole use of the holy communion, so hath it also the whole use of excommunication."<sup>2</sup> His logic was simple--an individual could not be kept from something which did not exist and since the Church of Rome did not have the Communion of Christ according to the Scriptures,

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:60

2. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:143.

there could be no excommunication from it.<sup>1</sup> The Anglican Church, possessing the Lord's Supper, could rightly exercise the Key of excommunication, but she did not interpret it as being the means whereby an individual was kept out of the Kingdom. In the act of excommunication the Church, through the clergy, recognized, confirmed, and made public what had already happened in the person's heart through rejecting the Word of God. When a person left the truth or refused to abide by the law of God, he lost God's presence within his heart; as the Reformer expressed it: "His spirit will not dwell in a filthy soul."<sup>2</sup> Separation from God meant exclusion from His Table and involved loss of fellowship with His children. Excommunication was "the judgment of the almighty and everlasting God"<sup>3</sup> which the Church confirmed and proclaimed.

Jewel believed that the purpose of excommunication was more redemptive than punitive in nature. He asserted:

If any therefore be excommunicate from the church,  
and removed from the fellowship of the gospel, and

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:144.

2. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:944.

3. Ibid.

from the hope of the life to come; let him humble himself, and pray unto God that he will open his eyes, and that he may see in what case he standeth.<sup>1</sup>

Excommunication, rather than lessening the responsibility of the ministry through the individual's separation from the Church, increased it. "A godly minister . . . if he be a true pastor," said the Bishop,

weepeth for the sins of the people, as did jeremy: he gusheth out into tears and consumeth away, as David, because of the ungodly; he is wounded at heart, and trembleth, as Paul, to see them perish. He seeketh for them, calleth after them, that they may return to him, as did John the evangelist; and is willing to die for their sake, if so be he might redeem them, as David was for Absalom. The people are his children: he is their father. Albeit they be wicked and filthy, yet he presenteth himself before God for them, and poureth forth his prayers, and saith, Sanctify them, O Lord, . . . Turn them, . . . give them a new heart and renew a clean spirit in them, that they may fear thee all the days of their life.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel concluded: "So careful is a good minister for the people of his charge be they never so ungodly . . . Yea, the more they lack the comfortable grace of God, the more must be his care for them."<sup>3</sup> The ministers of

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:943.

2. Ibid., 945.

3. Ibid. In the Apology Jewel seemed to indicate that he believed in an automatic confirmation of excommunication by God on the basis of the minister's judg-

the reformed Church of England, following the example of Christ and the apostles, were to seek all men no matter what their state or condition.

In refusing to account the Church of England any place in the Catholic Church of Christ, Harding denied that she had the right to practice excommunication. Therefore, in discussing excommunication, Jewel's chief

---

ment, declaring: "God himself doth so well allow it, that, whatsoever here in earth by their means is loosed and bound, God himself will loose and bind and confirm the same in heaven." Works, III:361. This however is followed immediately by his statement: "But the Key by which the Kingdom of Heaven is thus opened and shut . . . is the knowledge of Scripture." Loc. cit. Therefore in Jewel's thought, God's confirmation was dependent on the proper use of the Keys through the "knowledge of Scripture," i.e., when the Scriptures were rightly used, God's confirmation was assumed. Excommunication was thought by the Continental Reformers to be a part of the power of the Keys, and they uniformly believed that it should be used with discretion and for the purpose of restoring the fallen, rather than as a form of punishment. Cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, p. 46: "The apostle (Paul) also saith, that this power (excommunication) is given him, and yet to the intent he should therewith edify, and not destroy;" Calvin, Institutes, IV:xii:10: "Although excommunication also punishes the man, it does so in such a way that, by forewarning him of his future condemnation, it may call him back to salvation;" Luther, Of the Excommunication in Dr. Luther's Familiar Discourses, p. 235; "But we must add to that too great caution cannot be observed in procedures of this kind; every thing should be done with the greatest meekness, deliberation, prayer, and a deep sense of our own unworthiness; with a compassion for the offender, and a fixed design of embracing every opportunity of doing him good, by reproving; instructing, and, if possible, restoring him to his former privileges."

concern was to demonstrate that the English Church, as a member of the universal Church, rightfully held the ancient practice of excommunication; he did not indicate the exact process by which it was carried out.

### III. THE PRIESTHOOD OF BELIEVERS

#### A. THE PLACE OF THE LAITY

Though Jewel affirmed that the use of the Keys was the peculiar responsibility of the clergy in the Church of England, in order to maintain his belief in the all-powerful Word of God, he was forced to modify his view of this exclusive clerical right. Since it was the Word of God which wrought forgiveness and salvation, all else, including the ministry of the ordained clergy, was secondary to it. To say that a priest alone could use the Keys would be both to limit God and His Word and to place the ministry on the same level as the indispensable Scripture. God, the Bishop believed, could work through even the "simple" with His Word, for it was "mighty, be the pronouncer of it never so simple."<sup>1</sup> The Apologist cited the words of Augustine

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:356.



to clarify his position:

When Christ said unto Peter, "unto thee will I give the keys of the kingdom of heaven" he signified thereby the whole church. And also "whatsoever things thou shalt bind in earth, they shall be bound in heaven." Thou (being a layman) hast begun to have thy brother as a publican: thou bindest him in earth . . . and when thou hast loosed him in earth, he shall be loosed in heaven.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel also quoted the eleventh century exegete, Theophylact, as an example to his opponents that his position, and that of the Anglican Church, was not novel or new: "For not only the things that priests loose are loosed, but also whatsoever we (being laymen) . . . do bind or loose . . . shall also be bound or loosed."<sup>2</sup> The Reformer's belief that the Keys "be the knowledge of the Scriptures," and that it was not only the right, but also the duty of laymen to know the Scriptures, brought him to admit that it was possible, with that knowledge, for them to be the means whereby God's Word

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:356; Augustinus, De Verbis Evangelii Matthaei, Sermo. LXXXII, Caput IV, in Opera Omnia, Tom. V, Col. 509. Parenthesis is Jewel's.

2. Jewel, op. cit. III:357; Theophylactus, Matthaeum Commentarius, Caput XVIII, C, in Theophylacti Opera Omnia (Venetiis, 1754), Tom. I, p. 96. In this same context Jewel indicated that this power of laymen should not be strange to his Roman opponents since in emergencies the Church of Rome permitted laymen to baptize, which implied a remission of sins. Parenthesis is Jewel's.



would bring about forgiveness of sins.<sup>1</sup>

The priesthood of believers, a doctrine which played such a prominent part in the theology of the Continental theologians, especially Luther,<sup>2</sup> played an important, but less obvious part in Jewel's doctrine of the Church. The Reformer affirmed that there was "a difference between laymen and priests," and between "a priesthood internal and a priesthood external."<sup>3</sup> "We know," he said, "that the priest or minister of the Church of God is divided from the rest of his brethren, as was the tribe of Levi from the children of Israel, and hath a special office over the people."<sup>4</sup> Jewel's use of the word "office" in reference to the external priesthood is noteworthy, indicating his belief that the ordained ministry--the "priesthood"--was separated from

---

1. Cf. Luther, An Appeal to the Ruling Class in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, p. 120.

2. See Luther, op. cit., p. 113; The Pagan Servitude in op. cit., pp. 314-315. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:iv:9, II:vii:1, II:xvi:6, IV:xix:28; Bullinger, Decades, Volume III, Sermon VIII, pp. 285 ff., Volume IV, Sermon VII, pp. 290 ff., Volume V, Sermon III, pp. 107-108; Zwingli, Werke, Vol. III, pp. 273 ff.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:335.

4. Ibid., III:336.

the laity by a difference in function, responsibility, and position and not in kind.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel continued:

As touching the inward priesthood, and the exercise of the soul, we say even as St Peter, and St John, and Tertullian have said; in this sense every faithful christian man is a priest, and offereth unto God spiritual sacrifices.<sup>2</sup>

Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome, and Chrysostom were cited to support the Bishop's conviction that "whosoever is a member of Christ's body, whosoever is a child of the church, whosoever is baptized in Christ and beareth his name, is fully invested with this priesthood, and therefore may justly be called a priest."<sup>3</sup> Of the two priest-hoods, the internal and the external, Jewel believed the former to be the more important. It was possible, he

---

1. Cf. Luther, An Appeal to the Ruling Class in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, pp. 113-115.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:336; I Peter 2:5, Revelation 1:5, 6; Tertullianus, De Exhortatione Castitatis, in Opera Omnia (Parisii: J. P. Migne, 1844), Partis II, Volumen Posterius, p. 138.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.; Augustinus, De Civitate Dei, Liber XX, Caput X in Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, Col. 676; Ambrosius, Expositio Evangelii Secundum Lucam, Liber V, Caput VI, 33, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1364; Hieronymus, Commentariorum in Malachiam, Liber V, Caput VI, 33, in Opera Omnia, Tomus VI, Col. 1548; Chrysostomus, Epistolam II ad Corinthios, Hom. III, in Opera Omnia, Tom. X, p. 454. Cf. Doctrine in the Church of England (London: SPCK, 1922), p. 157.

claimed, to have a true Church of God "be there but three together and though they be laymen."<sup>1</sup> The Church of England did not therefore depend on her clergy for her existence, and she could continue without an external ministry of deacons, priests, and bishops should that unusual necessity arise; in such a situation she would not cease to be a valid Church even though only laymen were left.

Because of the conservative nature of the Reformation in England, his preoccupation with his duties as Bishop of Salisbury, and the extraordinary demands of the Harding controversies, Jewel did not have the opportunity either to expound fully this aspect of Reformed teaching or to give it the practical expression he might have desired. Nevertheless we have several indications of the importance Jewel assigned to the laity in the Church.

In 1559, as one of the government's visitational commissioners, Jewel visited the Cathedral Chapter at Exeter. The Chapter complained to the visitors that a

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:935; Tertullianus, De Exhortatione Castitatis, in Opera Omnia, Par. II, Vol. Post., p. 138.

number of people, both men and women from Exeter and London, had "invaded the choir of the cathedral . . . usurped the places of the lay clerks, and sang metrical psalms at the early morning service, unbidden and unlicense."<sup>1</sup> The Cathedral authorities requested that the Queen's visitors interpret the Act of Uniformity and the Royal Injunctions strictly and put a stop to such innovations. But the visitors, seeing many advantages to the singing of the metrical psalms by the men and women, reproved the Vicars choral for "their frowardness," and requested that they assist the singers "in these their godly doings."<sup>2</sup> Frere notes that the visitors concerned in this episode were Lord Montjoye, Jewel, and R. Mohun.

On March 5th, 1560, Jewel again expressed his approval of the laity's participation in public worship, this time in a letter to Peter Martyr. He wrote:

Religion is now somewhat more established than it was. The people are every where exceedingly inclined to the better part. The practice of joining in church music has very much conduced

---

1. Walter Howard Frere, editor, Visitation Articles and Injunctions (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1910), Vol. III, p. 42, note no. 1.

2. Ibid.

to this. For, as soon as they had once commended singing in public, in only one little church in London, immediately not only the churches in the neighbourhood, but even the towns far distant, began to vie with each other in the same practice. You may now sometimes at Paul's cross, after sermon, see six thousand persons, old and young, of both sexes, all singing together, and praising God. This sadly annoys the mass-priests, and the devil. For they perceive that by these means the sacred discourses sink more deeply into the minds of men, and that their kingdom is weakened and shaken at almost every note.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel could thus urge such participation since he believed that the Church of Christ was essentially the people of God, existing for their edification both through worship and preaching. He therefore encouraged the people to participate in the singing of Psalms, to receive communion frequently in both kinds, and condemned the Roman practice of "private masses," i.e., a celebration of the Lord's Supper without a congregation present. There could be no private celebration because the Eucharist was conceived of as an offering up of the people themselves to God through prayer and thanksgiving rather than the offering up of the body and blood of Christ by a priest on behalf of the people. Since the worship of God was a corporate act of the Body of

---

1. Jewel, Works, IV:1231.



Christ, it was necessary that the language of worship be understood by the people in order that they might take part intelligently. The Reformer cited examples from the early Church of the singing of Psalms "by the whole people . . . all together,"<sup>1</sup> and called particular attention to the practice in England in Bede's day<sup>2</sup> to further support his position.

The Bishop's doctrine of the priesthood of believers in many ways resembled that of Luther. The German Reformer claimed that there was no difference between the "Spiritual" and the "Temporal" estates, for all Christians were of the "Spiritual" by virtue of their incorporation into Christ.<sup>3</sup> A minister was superior to the layman only because of his office and his knowledge of the Scriptures, not because his ordination in any way made him superior in kind or estate.<sup>4</sup> The following illustration used by Luther explains his position:

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:266.

2. Ibid., I:305.

3. Luther, To the Nobility, in First Principles of the Reformation, p. 21.

4. Ibid., p. 23.



If a little company of pious Christian laymen were taken prisoners and carried away to a desert, and had not among them a priest consecrated by a bishop, and were they to agree to elect one of them, married or unmarried, and were to order him to baptize, to celebrate the mass, to absolve and to preach; this man would as truly be a priest, as if all the bishops and all the popes had consecrated him.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's statement that "be there but three together, and though they be laymen, yet there is a church," places him on common ground with Luther regarding the priesthood of all believers.

#### B. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ORDINATION

The Bishop's affirmation that all Christians were priests as participants in an "internal priesthood," and his rejection of Ordination as a Sacrament leads to a consideration of the significance of the rite of Ordination in his thought. In this endeavor we are soon thwarted since his only systematic treatment of Ordination is contained in A Treatise on the Sacraments in which he took great pains to demonstrate what Ordination was not, but he did not in this work, or elsewhere, define Ordination or outline its significance.

---

1. Luther, To the Nobility, in First Principles of the Reformation, pp. 21-23.

His position therefore must be deduced from his view of the ministry.

Jewel spoke almost exclusively in terms of the ministry as an office within the Church. After denying that Holy Orders were a Sacrament, he immediately called the ministry "a heavenly office, a holy ministry or service" and described this office as one which had previously been borne by the patriarchs and prophets.<sup>1</sup> The remainder of his consideration of Ordination was concerned solely with the work of the ministry and not with the rite of Ordination as he ostensibly proposed to do. Within this context it is evident that the Bishop regarded Ordination as the act by which an individual was set apart for the ministry; an official recognition and confirmation by secular and ecclesiastical authorities of an inward call to the work of preaching, teaching, and administration under the Word of God.<sup>2</sup> By this ceremony no extraordinary power was conferred enabling the recipient to change the elements of the Communion into the body and blood of Christ nor

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129.

2. See below, pp. 431-433.

was any power bestowed to forgive sins. It was rather through this rite that an individual was given authority to exercise his ministry.<sup>1</sup> Jewel's emphasis on the ministry was on the function of the clergyman rather than on any divine power which he possessed as a result of his ordination.

But though his interpretation of Ordination differed radically from that of the Roman Catholics, he was concerned that the rite be carried out legally and in conformity to the laws of the land and the Ordinal of the Church.<sup>2</sup> He defended the retention of the ancient forms, even to the use of the phrase: "Receive

1. Cf. Luther, Pagan Servitude, in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, pp. 308-309.

2. Jewel's concern that ordinations be properly performed is illustrated in his letter to Archbishop Parker on April 26th, 1568, in which he requested that "M. Lancaster, now elect of Armagh," be stayed "from further ordering of ministers" since he had "admitted and ordered one whom by the space of these eight years I for many good and just causes . . . have refused." Works, IV:1274. Ayre's note on Lancaster indicates that he was consecrated archbishop of Armagh on June 14th, 1568, almost two months after Jewel's letter, which would imply that Jewel regarded these ordinations as valid even though Lancaster was only "elect of Armagh." F. E. Brightman points out that this was not exactly the case since Lancaster had been "consecrated to Kildare nearly twenty years before and had since for a long time been suffragan of Marlborough." What Objections have been made to English Orders? (London: SPCK, 1958), p. 9.

the Holy Ghost,"<sup>1</sup> yet without the superstitious Roman practices and interpretations, as useful in the Church of England and not contrary to Scripture. The fact that there is no indication in any of his works that Jewel attached any theological significance to the ceremony of Ordination is certainly, in itself, of theological significance to Jewel's understanding of the Church and contributes, if only negatively, to a further insight into his concept of the ministry.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. See below, p. 284.

2. Jewel's view of Ordination did not differ greatly from that held by Archbishop Cranmer who stated: "In the admission of Officers, (Bishops, Priests, Curates, etc.) be divers comely ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, but only for a good order and seemly fashion: for if such offices and administrations were committed without such solemnity, they were nevertheless truly committed, and there is no more promise of God that Grace is given in the committing of the ecclesiastical office than in the committing of the civil office . . . In the New Testament he that is appointed to be a Bishop or a Priest needeth no consecration by the Scripture, for election or appointing thereto is sufficient." Quoted in George F. Bridges, The Oxford Reformers (London: Elliot Stock, 1908), p. 267. Jewel, however, evidently did not believe, as Cranmer, that election alone was sufficient to initiate a man into an ecclesiastical office. Cf. Gerard Culkin, The English Reformation (London: Sands and Co. Ltd., 1960), p. 54.

#### IV. THE ORGANIZATION OF THE MINISTRY

##### A. THE THREEFOLD MINISTRY

The work of the ministry which God instituted was of major importance in the Church of Christ, and the way in which it was ordered was both subordinate to and dependent upon that which it had been appointed to do--proclaim the Gospel. It must be remembered that Jewel's chief complaint about the Roman Catholic Church was that she had left the orthodox faith and practices of the Church of Christ and no longer fulfilled the teaching and preaching ministry on which the Church was dependent. Therefore, when he referred to the "degrees" or "orders" within the ministry of the Church, he laid the emphasis on the work and responsibility of the office, not upon supernatural origins and extraordinary power which he believed to be Roman innovations. The Reformer believed that the ministry had been established by God calling men to declare His Word and administer His Sacraments, but he had no concept of a divinely appointed apostolate or group of men, in the traditional Roman Catholic sense, on which the ministry



was dependent,<sup>1</sup> On the contrary, the ordering of the ministry, in Jewel's opinion, was subsequent and secondary to its establishment. The ministry of the Church was unified as to purpose, but to accomplish this ministerial work with the greatest economy and efficiency, he stated: "There be divers degrees of ministers in the church; whereof some be deacons, some priests, some bishops," but to all without distinction had been "committed the office to instruct the people, and the whole charge and setting forth of religion."<sup>2</sup> It would be the responsibility of Jewel's successors to defend the threefold episcopal ministry of the Anglican Church against the Puritan's presbyterianism; it had fallen to him to defend the position of the English

---

1. K. E. Kirk, editor of The Apostolic Ministry, presents a view in direct opposition to that offered by Jewel. Kirk believes (pp. 7-14) that Christ established an Apostolate, from which all bishops in legitimate succession are descended, and this episcopal order is the essential ministry of the Church on which all other ministries are dependent. This is typical of the view offered by high-churchmen. J. P. Hickinbotham takes exception to Kirk's view and presents an opinion almost identical with that Jewel's. See Hickinbotham's "The Doctrine of the Ministry" in The Ministry of the Church, Stephen Neill, editor, pp. 31-44.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:59.



Church by claiming three orders<sup>1</sup> in the ministry against Roman claims that (1) there were seven orders in the ministry,<sup>2</sup> and (2) the Bishop of Rome was the universal Bishop of the Church and the Vicar of Christ.

Unlike the work of the ministry, Jewel did not claim that the three orders in the Anglican ministry were of divine origin. His defence in the particular sections of the Apology and the Defence in which he enumerated the three orders of the clergy had no positive references to the reasons for the retention of deacons, priests, and bishops, but instead consisted of a defence for having excluded the four minor orders in the Roman Church. This omission had been made on the grounds that the ancient fathers were not in agreement on any fixed

1. Article XXXVI of the XXXIX Articles of Religion mentioned Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, while the Preface to "The Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons" mentioned only the three named by Jewel.

2. Though the Council of Trent (Session XXII, Chapter II in Canons and Decrees, p. 171) enumerated seven different orders, i.e., Door-keeper, Lector, Exorcist, Acolyte, Sub-deacon, Deacon, and Priest, not all Roman Catholic authorities agree that seven is the absolute number of orders. E. g., some include Psalmist and Bishop. See The Catholic Encyclopedia, edited by Charles Hebermann et al (London: Caxton Publishing Co., 1907-1914), Vol. IV, p. 277.

number,<sup>1</sup> and that, though at one time such offices as Door-keeper, Psalmist, Exorcist, Reader, and Acolyte served "good use . . . in the Church of God," now Jewel affirmed:

There is nothing left, saving the bare name only, without any manner, use, or office. For neither doth the "ostarius" keep out the excommunicates, nor doth the "acolythus" wait upon the bishop, nor doth the exorcist cast forth devils, nor doth the psalmist sing psalms, nor doth the reader openly pronounce the scriptures.<sup>2</sup>

These offices, the Bishop continued, had been eliminated in the Anglican Church because of their uselessness and lack of authenticity. He also added that as far as the Church of Rome was concerned the other offices might well be abandoned, because "nor doth the deacon make provision for the poor, nor doth the bishop preach the word of God."<sup>3</sup> Although he did not state just when the three orders of the ministry as obtained in the Church of England originated, he affirmed that the offices of deacon, priest, and bishop had been retained for they alone were of ancient usage and useful in the Church

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:272.

2. Ibid., III:274.

3. Ibid.

of Christ.<sup>1</sup>

It is noteworthy that Jewel, together with many of his contemporaries, made no Scriptural claims for the episcopate and the threefold ministry as it was held in the English Church.<sup>2</sup> It was an episcopal Church which he defended and which he believed was supported by history and not contrary to the Word of God. Jewel

---

1. The Ordinal was more explicit than Jewel in fixing the origin of the threefold ministry, declaring: "It is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Cf. R. H. Malden, "Potestas Ordinis" in The Church Quarterly Review, Vol. 137, No. 273 (October-December, 1943), pp. 30-31.

2. In his preface to Hooker's Works, Keble expressed wonder at this failure of the Reformer, stating: "It is notorious, however, that such was not in general the line preferred by Jewel, Whitgift, Bp. Cooper, and others, to whom the management of that controversy was entrusted during the early part of Elizabeth's reign. They do not expressly disavow, but they carefully shun, that unreserved appeal to antiquity, in which one would have thought they must have discerned the very strength of their cause to lie. It is enough, with them to shew that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim." The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of His Life and Death by Isaac Walton, arranged by John Keble (Oxford: The University Press, 1845), Vol. I, p. lix.

himself had been ordained deacon and priest during the reign of Edward VI and had accepted his office of bishop under Elizabeth with reluctance, not because there was any question in his mind regarding the organization of the Church or the office of Bishop, but because he thought himself to be "wanting in ability"<sup>1</sup> to perform so great a responsibility. It is plain that he accepted the office of the episcopate and its accompanying obligations. It now becomes our task to determine the significance of this office in his thought.

### 1. THE OFFICE OF DEACON

When Jewel mentioned the first of the three offices in the Church of England, that of deacon, it was only to illustrate what to him were more significant matters than the office itself. The adaptability of offices in the ancient Church to the needs of the time was illustrated by the fact that in the time of Ambrose the deacon preached, but in later centuries he was not permitted to do so.<sup>2</sup> In proof that the Roman practice of Communion in one kind only was

---

1. Letter of Jewel to Rudolph Gaultier, November 2nd, 1559, in Zurich Letters, I, p. 48.

2. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:75.

in error, Jewel observed that in the early days of the Church, in the absence of priests or bishops, deacons had administered both the wine and the bread to the people.<sup>1</sup> It was evident that in the time of Chrysostom the people had been able to pray during worship services in their own language since it was recorded that the deacon was the officer who called them to prayer.<sup>2</sup> The overwhelming desire of the clergy of Rome to advance themselves over their brother clergy was reflected by the Roman deacons, in the time of Augustine, equating themselves with priests.<sup>3</sup> But because there was no issue at stake regarding the office of deacon between the Anglicans and the Romans as there was regarding the offices of priest and bishop, together with their duties and authority, Jewel found no necessity for discussing the least of the three orders. Nevertheless, the context in which Jewel spoke of the office of deacon implied that he considered the office to be chiefly one of service under the direction of the

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:292

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., I:355.



priests and bishops, and a preliminary step to be taken before ordination to the priesthood. It would be safe to assume from what the Reformer said about the responsibility of deacons in the Communion service that he was in accord with the teaching of the Ordinal of the Church, which affirmed that deacons had been "appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in Divine Service, and specially when he ministereth the holy Communion, and to help in the distribution thereof." Though the Ordinal continued by indicating the deacon's responsibility toward the sick and poor of the parish, Jewel made only negative reference to this work when he contended that the deacon in the Roman Church no longer performed such duties, but he did not specifically include these areas of service when speaking of the duties of the deacon in the English Church.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. THE OFFICES OF PRIEST, BISHOP AND ARCHBISHOP

J. B. Lightfoot<sup>2</sup> was anticipated by Jewel

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:274; see above, p. 182.

2. Lightfoot's position was presented in the section entitled "The Christian Ministry" in his



in his belief that "elder," "presbyter," "priest,"<sup>1</sup> and "bishop" were originally different names used to designate the same office or order.<sup>2</sup> Since, however,

---

Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Philippians  
(London: Macmillan and Co., 1869), pp. 177-267.

1. Jewel accepted and employed the word "priest" without making any effort to justify its use. He did not use the word in the traditional Roman Catholic sense of an ordained individual with divine power, but as a legitimate derivative from "presbyter" which he believed to be synonymous with "minister," i.e., one who served. He also used it when differentiating between the other two orders--deacon and bishop. Cf. "Excursus on the use of the word 'Priest' in the Book of Common Prayer," in The Tutorial Prayer Book, edited by Charles Neil and J. M. Willoughby (London: The Harrison Trust, 1913), pp. 515-520.

2. The office of bishop was not included in the listing of the seven orders in the Roman Church by the Council of Trent (Session XXIII, Chapter II, "On the Seven Orders," in Canons and Decrees, p. 171). Where bishops are mentioned (Session XXIII, "Decree on Reformation," Chapter II, in ibid., p. 178), they are referred to as having received the rite of "consecration" rather than "ordination." According to Roman Catholic doctrine the consecration of bishops marks the plenitude of the priesthood, and during the act of consecration the fullness of the priestly powers is bestowed. See The Catholic Encyclopedia, edited by Charles G. Hebermann et al, Vol. IV, p. 277. The totality of the Sacrament of Order is considered to be the supreme Order of the Priesthood, other inferior orders containing only a part thereof (ibid., Vol. XI, p. 280). Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV: iii:8; Wyclif, "De Sacramento Ordinis," in Triologus, Liber IV, Caput XV, p. 295; The Institution of a Christian Man, in Formularies of Faith, pp. 105, 281; Luther, An Answer to the Superchristian, Superspiritual, and Superlearned Book of the Goat Emser, in A Compend of Luther's Theology (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943), p. 139.

it was his intent to return to the purity of the early Church, and as far as he was concerned the further back into history it was possible for him to go for material to justify the Anglican Church, the better it would serve his purpose, he was content to show that a priest and a bishop were in the beginning one; he did not elaborate the development of the bishop from the priest in detail.

Jewel first demonstrated that "elders," "priests," and "presbyters" were all the same. Commenting on Harding's chiding of a "youthful gentle-woman" for calling priests "elders," the Reformer observed:

If ye had been either so sagely studied as ye pretend, and your friends have thought, ye might soon have learned that "presbyter," a priest, is nothing but "senior;" that is, an elder, and that a priest and an elder are both one thing.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's main source of authority for his position that originally a priest and a bishop were all one, was Jerome, whom he quoted frequently:

These things have I spoken, to the intent to shew that in old times priests and bishops were

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:912; cf. Philip Schaff, A History of the Creeds of Christendom (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877), Vol. III, p. 605: "The English Reformers . . . fully admitted . . . the original identity of the office of bishop and presbyter."

all one; and that in process, and by degrees, the whole charge was brought unto one man (he meaneth within one diocese), that the occasions of dissension might be rooted out.<sup>1</sup>

On another occasion Jerome asserted: "I hear it said that there is a man broken out unto such wilful fury, that he placeth deacons before priests, that is to say, before bishops."<sup>2</sup> Jerome's categorical statement that "a priest and a bishop is all one thing"<sup>3</sup> proved conclusively to the Reformer that his position on the original identity of priest and bishop was justified.

Jewel recognized that the superiority of a bishop was the result of an evolutionary process arising from the increasing need for a central authority in the ecclesiastical organization of a given area.

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:373; Hieronymus, Comm. in Epist. ad Tit., Cap. I, in Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, Col. 563. Jewel's parenthesis was included to show that this passage from Jerome could not be used by the Roman Catholics in support of papal supremacy. Granmer also followed Jerome on his position regarding the equality of priests and bishops, stating: "The bishops and priests at one time were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion." Quoted in George F. Bridges, The Oxford Reformers, p. 267.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:272; Hieronymus, Epistola CXVI, Ad Evangelum, in Opera Omnia, Tom. I, Col. 1192-1193.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.; Hieronymus, loc. cit.

Support for this belief was again found in the words of Jerome:

So likewise St Hierome saith that, notwithstanding the power of all priests by the authority of God's word be one and equal, "yet men, by policy to avoid contention, appointed one priest in every city," to order and to direct his brethren.<sup>1</sup>

This organizational pattern, with the bishop selected from among the priests to exercise authority, had proven so useful that it had become common in the early Church, and this worthwhile "custom" had been retained as the polity of the Church of England. Summoning once again the assistance of Jerome he declared: "Let bishops understand (whereunto we add further, let the bishops of Rome themselves understand) they are in authority over priests more by custom than by order of God's truth."<sup>2</sup> Jewel maintained that "the office of a bishop is above the office of a priest (not by authority of the scriptures, but) after the names of honour, which the custom of the church hath now obtained."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:348; Hieronymus, Comm. in Epist. ad Tit., Cap. I, in Opera Omnia, Tom VII, Col. 562.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:292; cf. III:294; Hieronymus, Comm. in Epist. ad Tit., Cap I, in Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, Col. 555. Parenthesis is Jewel's.

3. Jewel, op. cit., III:294; Augustinus, Epistola LXXXII, Ad Hieronymo, Caput IV, 33, in Opera Omnia.



Citing both Augustine and Ambrose as his authority the Reformer noted that because of the human origins of the office of bishop, the authority which he exercised was by virtue of his superior "degree," not because he followed in the succession of a superior "kind" of minister. The degrees of priest and bishop were the same, but the bishop was the "first" or "highest priest."<sup>1</sup> Jewel was among those who believed the office of a bishop to "be one of ecclesiastical development, not of theological principle."<sup>2</sup>

---

Tomus II, Col. 290. Parenthesis is Jewel's.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:439; Ambrosius, Comm. in I Epist. ad Tim., Cap. III, in Opera Omnia, Tom. II, Col. 295; Augustinus, Quaestiones ex Utroque Mixtim, Quaest. CI, "De Jactantia Romanorum Levitarum," in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Appendix, Col. 2302. B. M. Hamilton Thompson, in her desire to prove that Jewel was in agreement with later Anglican developments regarding the concept of the relation between the bishop and priest, claims: "The right of a bishop to a position above and other than that of a presbyter, he (Jewel) takes for granted." "The Post-Reformation Episcopate in England--From the Reformation to the Restoration," in The Apostolic Ministry, K. E. Kirk, editor, p. 427. This statement is accurate if it is understood that this "right" and "position . . . other than" comes of custom and for the purpose of efficient administration; it is totally incorrect if divine origin and difference in kind is implied.

2. J. P. Hickinbotham, "The Doctrine of the Ministry," The Ministry of the Church, p. 39.

In accepting the position of bishop, Jewel believed that he had entered into a work of pastoral supervision which had been established, not by God, but by ecclesiastical custom. Yet this office had not been instituted primarily for government in the usual temporal sense; it had been established chiefly as an office of pastoral service and direction which could be described by the word "superintendent." Harding used "superintendent" in a derogatory sense when speaking of the men who sat in the Convocations of the Church of England, but Jewel responded by observing that the word was an excellent way of designating the work of a bishop:

Whereas it hath pleased you, as well here as elsewhere, to sport yourself with superintendents and superintendentships, and to refresh your wits with so vain a fantasy of your own; if ye had been so deeply travailed in the doctors, new or old, as ye bear us in hand, ye might easily have known that a superintendent is an ancient name, and signifieth none other but a bishop.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:906. Jewel, unlike some English Reformers, did not object to the use of the word "bishop" because of its alleged misuse in the Roman Church. He used "bishop" exclusively, his only reference to "superintendents" being in this quotation. Strype records that "the very name of 'bishop' grew odious among the people, and the word 'superintendent' began to be affected." He cited Bishop John Roynet's words: "I deny not . . . that the name 'bishop' may be



Those called to the position of bishop in the Church of England, Jewel believed, were truly bishops because they performed the pastoral function of their office. They were in every sense of the word "superintendents."<sup>1</sup>

---

well taken; but because of the evilness of the abuse hath marred the goodness of the word, it cannot be denied but that it was not amiss to join for a time another word with it in his place . . . the word 'superintendent' is such a name, that papists themselves . . . cannot find fault withal." John Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822), Vol. II, Pt. 2, p. 141. For the use of this term among Continental and Scottish Reformers, see James L. Ainslie, The Doctrines of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1940), pp. 95, 96, 105-115, 197.

1. The English congregation in Frankfort discussed the problem of what title their minister should bear in the following manner: "(1) 'Bishop' (though first in nomination) was declined as improper, because here he had no inspection over any Diocese, but only a cure of a congregation, on which very account Mr. Scory (though formerly bishop of Chichester) when preacher to the Congregation at Emden, took upon himself the title of Superintendent. (2) 'Superintendent' was here also sailed, as the same in effect, only a bad Latin word instead of a good Greek. (3) 'Minister' also was disliked for the principal Preacher (though admitted to signify his assistants,) perchance as a term of too much compliance with the opposite party. (4) 'Pastor' was at last pitched upon, as freest from exception, most expressive of the office, and least obnoxious to offence." Thomas Fuller, Church History of Britain (London: Printed for John Williams, 1656), Book VIII, p. 31. It is interesting to note that there is no indication that at any time did the exiles consider using the word "priest."

As Jewel believed it was because of custom that a bishop was superior to a priest,<sup>1</sup> so he believed it was because of custom that, for the sake of a well ordered and disciplined Church, the office of archbishop had been created. He claimed it was legitimate, in spite of Roman misuse, to call a bishop the "head of the Church," when reference was made to a particular Church, or to several Churches under one primus. Citing Old Testament, New Testament, and early Church examples he defended the position of archbishop in the Anglican Church, not as being the head of the Church of England as the pope was the head of the Church of Rome or as inherently superior to other bishops, but as chief among equals whose position existed by custom and tradition for the efficient governing and administering of ecclesiastical affairs. Archbishop was not a position of divine origin.<sup>2</sup>

In summary then! Jewel believed that the three orders: deacon, priest, and bishop had been retained

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:294.

2. Ibid., III:269-270, 292. See Jewel, Certain Frivolous Objections, Works, IV:1299. According to The Institution of the Christian Man, the offices of patriarch, primate, metropolitan, archbishop and bishop all originated with the fathers. Formularies of Faith, p. 118.

in the Church of England because they had existed in the primitive Church, were not contrary to Scripture, and unlike the inferior orders in the Roman Church, were of practical value. But, as Till observes, no attempt was made "to erect on these foundations any speculative theology of the episcopate in its relation to the being of the Church."<sup>1</sup> Jewel did not think in terms of a particular form of the ministry which was an "essential ministry;" he thought of the ministry's work which was essential.

#### B. PAPAL SUPREMACY

The Reformer spent little time in defending the threefold ministry of the English Church for he was more anxious to refute the Roman claim to universal sovereignty over the entire Church.<sup>2</sup> In Harding's contentions Jewel clearly saw the position which he was attacking, and against which he reacted. He declared:

The main ground of (Harding's) . . . whole plea is this, that the bishop of Rome, whatsoever it

---

1. B. D. Till, The Historic Episcopate, Kenneth Carey, editor (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954), p. 68.

2. See the Bull "Una Sanctum" of Boniface VIII, November 18th, 1302.

shall like him to determine in judgment, can never err; that he is always undoubtedly possessed of God's holy Spirit; that at his only hand we must learn to know the will of God; that in his only holiness standeth the unity and safety of the church; that whatsoever is divided from him must be judged an heretic; and that without the obedience of him there is no hope of salvation.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel replied to the Roman assertions of papal supremacy by reiterating his belief in the nature of the Church. Christ was her sole Head and was ever present to assist her, hence He needed no "man to supply his room."<sup>2</sup> The Church catholic was so vast and incomprehensible that it was impossible for a single mortal man to even conceive of it without ever trying to "rightly and duly" govern it.<sup>3</sup> The Reformer recognized the truth of the practical Roman Catholic approach which claimed that "dissension and quarrels be the sooner ended when all things be put over to one man,"<sup>4</sup> but he believed the true basis for

---

1. Jewel, An Epistle to Queen Elizabeth, Works, III:116.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:174.

3. Ibid.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:276.

"unity and a quiet government of the Church of God" involved more than centralized control by a single individual--it was to be found in the words of St. Paul:

Christ ascending above all the heavens hath given (not to one universal pope to rule the whole, but) some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the building up of the body of Christ; that we may all come into the unity of the faith.<sup>1</sup>

It was "by these means God thought it sufficient to preserve his church in unity, and never made mention of one universal pope."<sup>2</sup>

Since Christ was the Head of the Church, her Foundation and Rock, the Roman Catholic belief that the Church had been founded by Christ and built on the Apostle Peter was emphatically denied by Jewel and the other English Reformers. The Apologist affirmed with Origin that "whosoever is Christ's disciple, he is the rock."<sup>3</sup> To the Reformer the Scriptures clearly indicated that Christ had used all His apostles in

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:283-284; Ephesians 4:8-13; parenthesis is Jewel's. Cf. above, pp. 33 ff.; Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:6, IV:vi:17.

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:284.

3. Ibid., III:297; Origenes, Commentariorum in Evangelium Matthaei, Tom XII, 10, in Opera Omnia, Vol. III, pp. 146-147.



building His Church, and He had used them all equally. Jewel recognized that Peter had been almost universally acclaimed "the first man" and "best of a company," but he was called thus in the same sense as those were called "the chief of the house or stock, the chief of the embassy, the chief of the cooks."<sup>1</sup> The apostles were all equal, but Peter was the first among them; he was not their ruler.

As the apostles were equal, so the Reformer believed all bishops in the Church, wherever they might be, to be the same in authority.<sup>2</sup> He defended the view of the episcopate as held by Cyprian, i.e., "there is but one bishoprick, and a piece thereof is perfectly

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:430.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:59-60. In this section of the Apology, Jewel's apparent identification of the apostles of the New Testament and the bishops of the later Church is not to be taken as an indication that the Apologist believed bishops to be in direct descent from the apostles, thus implying a doctrine of Apostolic Succession. In the light of the Bishop's belief in the original identity of priest and bishop, together with his rejection of the Roman doctrine of Succession (see later chapter on Succession), this identification of the apostles with bishops was made to emphasize the equality of bishops--his reasoning being that if all the apostles were equal, there was no reason why a particular bishop, i.e., the Bishop of Rome, should be inherently super to all others. See Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:908.



and holden of every particular bishop,"<sup>1</sup> and supported Jerome's admonition: "Let all bishops understand that they ought to govern the church in common, or as all in one."<sup>2</sup> Using another analogy, Jewel affirmed that as "there is one church divided by Christ into many members throughout the world; likewise (there is) one bishoprick poured far abroad by the agreeable multitude of many bishops."<sup>3</sup> These bishops, the Reformer observed, often consented together for mutual encouragement and advice, and to decide weighty matters, but they did so as equals, and in the early Church the bishops did not find it necessary to resort to Rome.<sup>4</sup>

As has been noted previously, the Roman claim that the pope was the Vicar of Christ on earth was also erroneous.<sup>5</sup> Christ, it was true, had appointed

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:290; Cyprianus, De Unit. Eccles. in Cypriani Opera Omnia (Parisii: J. P. Migne, 1865), Vol. II, Col. 516.

2. Jewel, op. cit., I:349; Hieronymus, Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Titum, in Opera Omnia, Vol. VII, Col. 563.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:301.

4. Ibid.; cf. Institution of a Christian Man in Formularies of Faith, p. 118.

5. Pope Innocent III was the first pope to con-

a Vicar on earth to rule for Him after His ascension, but this Vicar was not the Bishop of Rome; He was "the power of the Holy Ghost (sent) to direct them that believe."<sup>1</sup> As God worked through the hearts of His servants by the Holy Spirit, they, His ministers, became His vicars--as Jewel asserted: "Christ is the Head of the church; and his vicars be the priests that do their message in the church in the stead of Christ."<sup>2</sup>

#### IV. SUMMARY

In Jewel's treatment of the ministry of the Church we see reflected his desire to have the Church of England return to the spiritual basis of the Church of the New Testament and to bring the ministry into conformity to the mind of Christ. The Roman Church had

---

sistently apply this title to himself. Cf. C. R. Cheney and W. H. Semple, editors, Select Letters of Pope Innocent III Concerning England (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953), p. 8. Cf. also A. L. Moore, History of the Reformation (London: Kegan Paul, Trench Trumner and Co., 1890), p. 333.

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:379; Tertullianus, Liber De Praescriptionibus Adversus Haereticos, Cap. X, III, in Opera Omnia, Vol. II, Col. 26.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.; Eusebius, Epistola Eusebii Papae Tertiae, in Grabbe, Concilia Omnia (Coloniae Agrippinae: 1551), Tom. I, p. 215.

divided society effectively into the secular and the sacred--the laity and the clergy--and had organized the clergy along rigid hierarchical lines, viewing its work in a mechanical and perfunctory manner. It was Jewel's purpose to defend the view of the ministry as held by the Anglican Church: a view which involved the whole Body of Christ and raised all her members to a high spiritual level. For the Reformer, all Christians through their baptism and ingrafting into Christ, were of the spiritual estate and a part of an internal priesthood which was the Church. The external priesthood of ordained clergy served under Christ within this wider, and more important, internal priesthood, and differed from the unordained members of the Body in degree, function, and responsibility only. Within this external priesthood, priests and bishops were of the same order, the bishop being the first priest, consecrated according to ancient tradition, for leadership and organizational efficiency. There was no essential ministry in this external priesthood upon which other orders, and the Church herself, depended; it was the work of the ministry as a whole which was necessary for the life of the Church. Christ's Vicar on earth was not the Bishop of Rome who ruled the clergy and laity

alike, but was each individual through whom God's Spirit operated, especially the clergy who had been particularly called to minister and serve under Him. The Lord had built His Church on all His Apostles, each one of whom was a "rock;" Peter was acknowledged to be the first among them, but he was the first among equals. Whereas the Church of Rome designed her worship services for the people, whose presence was not always required, e.g., at the Communion, the reformed Church of England designed her services to be conducted with the people, giving them opportunity to take an active and intelligent part.

It is evident that Jewel's doctrine of the ministry in the Church had many features in common with that doctrine as it was held by his fellow Reformers on the Continent. He and they were in agreement on all major issues. Ministers had to be legally called to their office, both by God and by men, to preach the Word of God as opposed to officiating at the sacrifice of the Mass. Orders within the Church's ministry was not a Sacrament; it did not confer grace; it did not change the estate of the recipient, but initiated him into an office of leadership among the people of God. Ministers, with the exception of deacons, were

equal, although certain men might be set apart as bishops: a position of authority for the good governing of the Church. The authority to bind and loose, to forgive and retain sins, and of ecclesiastical discipline had been committed to the ministry, yet because there was no inherent power in this office, it was the power of the Word which was exercised in the performance of these functions. The Reformers were one in their confession that Christ alone was the Church's Founder; they were one in their repudiation of the authority of the Roman Church over all of Christendom, and in their rejection of the establishment of the Church on Peter.

Unlike these Continental Reformers who rejected the doctrine that ordination imparted an indelible priestly character on the receiver, Jewel had nothing to say about this aspect of ordination.<sup>1</sup>

Though the Reformers of the sixteenth century might start with the same basic presuppositions in regard to the ministry, and though all might agree on the absolute authority of the Scriptures and share a

---

1. See Luther, To the Ruling Class in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, pp. 114-115; Pagan Servitude inop. cit., pp. 312, 319.



desire to return to the purity of the early Church, it is clear that the environment in which their concepts formed, to a large extent, determined the way in which they developed and applied their doctrine of the ministry.

Luther, in his role as Reformer, had "no pre-conceived and overall plan for the building of evangelical churches."<sup>1</sup> He idealistically believed that through the simple preaching of the Word a new Church order would arise naturally, but by 1520, when he was forced to appeal to the Christian nobility for aid, he had abandoned this view. The ordering of the Church, for Luther, became, in comparison to the Word of God and personal faith, a matter of relative unimportance. Ultimately the ordering of the Church in Lutheran areas was left to the magistrates of the local towns and territorial princes. Thus different forms of ecclesiastical government existed in Hesse, Saxony, and Wittenberg, though all were Lutheran districts.

Calvin approached the whole matter of Church

---

1. Wilhelm Pauck, "The Ministry in the Time of the Continental Reformation," in Neibuhr and Williams, The Ministry in Historical Perspective, p. 117. Pauck is the source of much of the information on Luther and Calvin in this Summary.



order with a preconceived plan which he believed was based on the New Testament, was according to the institution of Christ, and therefore was one from which there was to be no deviation. Those offices which had been prescribed for all time were preachers, teachers, elders, and deacons. Wherever those of Calvin's school went--Holland, France, Hungary, or Scotland--this Church order was established and followed in almost minute detail.

Jewel was typically Anglican in his consideration of the ordering of the ministry, and followed a middle course between the Lutherans and the Calvinists. He did not agree with the German Reformer's views to the extent that he was willing to admit that any ordering of the Church in England would be equally acceptable, nor did he entertain for a moment the thought that several different ecclesiastical polities could exist in the Realm. Unlike Calvin, the Bishop made no claims that the polity of the Anglican Church was based on the Scriptures, or on Christ's institution. He defended the retention of the threefold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop by the English Church because it was an ancient ordering of the Church, not contrary to the Scriptures, a practical method of

governing the Church, and most useful under the circumstances then prevailing in England. The entire ministry of the Church, and especially the episcopal office, had been restored to its original position of pastoral activity through preaching and teaching.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUCCESSION

When considering the ministry of the Church of England, Jewel also had to deal with that concept which loomed large in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church in the sixteenth century, and still does today: Apostolic Succession. The claim of the Roman Church to be the only true Church of Christ rested on the belief that Christ had committed the care of His Church to Peter and the other apostles, and to their direct successors--the bishops under the pope. Therefore, anyone or any group leaving this fellowship was considered to be outside of Christ's Church. As early as the second century Irenaeus wrote: "Any one who stands aloof from the primitive succession, and assembles in any place whatever, we must regard with suspicion, either as heretics and evil minded; or as schismatics . . . All these have fallen from the truth."<sup>1</sup> Developing this

---

1. Irenaeus, Adv. haereses, IV:XXVI:2, in Documents of the Christian Church, Henry Bettenson, editor,

theme, Cyprian laid the foundation for future Roman Catholic claims that the existence of the episcopate, through proper succession, was necessary for the "esse" of the Church. Writing in the middle of the third century this Father stated that the Church was

. . . made up of the people united to their priest and the flock that cleaves to its shepherd. Hence you should know that the bishop is in the Church and the Church in the bishop, and that if any one be not with the bishop he is not in the Church . . . Whereas the Church is one and may not be together or sundered, but should assuredly be bound together and united by the glue of the priests who are in harmony with one another.<sup>1</sup>

This emphasis on the importance of the office of the bishop, which originated in the desire of the Church to maintain purity of doctrine through its proper transmission from the head of a local Church to his successor, eventually evolved into the Roman concept that the

---

(London: Oxford University Press, 1943), p. 99. R. H. Malden observed that Irenaeus used "Apostolic Succession," but in the plural where it "meant succession in office and was a guarantee of doctrinal orthodoxy. It had nothing to do with Ordination." Irenaeus wrote during the Gnostic controversy and it was his purpose to show that certain Churches had been founded by the apostles and each bishop since that time was known, therefore the Churches were known to be faithful. "Potestas Ordinis," Church Quarterly Review, Vol. 137, pp. 33-34.

1. Cyprian, Epistle lxvi:7, in Bettenson, Documents, p. 104. Bettenson notes that "'Sacredos,' 'priest,' normally means 'bishop' in Cyprian." Ibid.

episcopal office and ministry, derived from the Roman pontiff, was essential to the existence of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

This was a crucial problem for Jewel, because if it could have been shown that the Church of England had departed from that succession originating in the apostles on which depended the catholicity of the Church, the opponents of the Anglican Church would have had a legitimate reason for declaring that she had severed herself from the true Church of God. The Bishop could either show that the Church of England was a legitimate Church because she had retained the apostolic succession which the Roman Church regarded as of supreme importance, or he could claim that the apostolic succession was not a sufficient foundation upon which to build a true Church. Jewel chose the latter approach. It was his conviction that although the bishops in the Church of England were ordered and

---

1. An example of the result of this evolutionary process is seen in the way "Church" is defined in the Dictionnaire De Théologie Catholique, A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, editors (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1909), Vol. IV, p. 2110: "The strict theological definition of the Church according to the New Testament is that it is a society of the faithful united by a complete confession of the same Christian faith, by the same sacraments, and by submission to the same supernatural authority of the Roman Pontiff who is the Vicar of Jesus Christ."

consecrated according to ancient custom, the Anglican Church did not depend on this succession as a guarantee of her faith. The legitimacy and catholicity of the English Church depended not on the apostolic succession held by the Roman Church, but on the succession and retention of correct doctrine, lawful possession of place, and a proper fulfillment of pastoral functions.

### I. THE CONSECRATION OF ENGLISH BISHOPS

Harding realized that the whole matter of proper succession was of the utmost consequence, and that much depended on the way in which Jewel, speaking for the Church of England, met this challenge.<sup>1</sup> Speaking directly to Jewel and pressing this point Harding asked:

Therefore, to go from your succession, which ye cannot prove, and to come to your vocation, how say you sir? you bear yourself as though you were bishop of Salisbury. But how can you prove your vocation? By what authority usurp you the administration of doctrine and the sacraments? What can you allege for the right and proof of your ministry? Who hath called you? Who hath laid hands on you? By what example hath he done it?

---

1. Hans Kung refers to Apostolic Succession as "the central challenge of the Reformation." The Council and Reunion, translated by Cecily Hastings (London: Sheed and Ward, 1961), pp. 189 ff.



How and by whom are you consecrated? Who hath sent you? Who hath committed to you the office you take upon you?<sup>1</sup>

Harding believed that the burden of proof was on Jewel to show his "bishoply pedigree," and he asked: "If you can prove no succession, then whereby hold you?"<sup>2</sup>

Jewel responded by claiming that the bishops within the Church of England were properly ordered and consecrated. He called Harding's attention to the fact that if his ordination was questioned, that that of Harding was also in doubt, for he asserted:

I am a priest, made long since by the same order and ordinance, I think also by the same man and the same hands, that you, M. Harding, were made priest by, . . . therefore ye cannot well doubt of my priesthood without like doubting of your own.<sup>3</sup>

He added: "Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have ever been, by free election of the chapter; by consecration of the archbishop and other three

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:321.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:334. Evidently Harding had doubted his own ordination, for upon leaving England he was reordained by a Roman bishop. See W. H. Frere, The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I, p. 88.

bishops; and by the admission of the prince."<sup>1</sup> The Reformer declared that bishops in the Anglican Church succeeded their predecessors: "To be short, we succeed the bishops that have been before our days. We are elected, consecrated, confirmed, and admitted, as they were. If they were deceived in any thing, we succeed them in place, but not in error."<sup>2</sup>

There were two notable differences between the consecration of Roman bishops and those of the Church of England. The first was the elimination of all superstitious and insignificant elements in the consecration ceremony. In reply to a letter of congratulation on his consecration as bishop from his friend Josiah Simler, Jewel said:

As to your expressing your hopes that our bishops will be consecrated without any superstitious and offensive ceremonies, you mean, I suppose, without oil, without the chrism, without the tonsure. And you are not mistaken; for the sink would indeed have been emptied to no purpose, if we had suffered those dregs to settle at the bottom. Those oily, shaven, portly hypocrites, we have sent back to Rome from whence we first imported them.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:334.

2. Ibid., III:339.

3. Jewel, Works, IV:1221. Jewel here referred to

In addition to the exclusion of the Roman "superstitious and offensive ceremonies," the Church of England did not recognize the right of the Bishop of Rome to confirm the election of bishops outside of his own Roman Province. Harding had stated: "For lack of the pope's confirmation any bishop newly elected could not rightly have enjoyed his bishoprick, as it appeareth by many examples."<sup>1</sup> Jewel's denial of the pope's right to confirm the election of a bishop outside of his own jurisdiction was based on his conviction that there was no warrant for such belief in Scripture, in any ancient council, or in any of the writings of the ancient fathers. The position of the Anglican Church as the national Church of an independent kingdom made any outside intervention impossible. The Apologist affirmed that the bishops in the English Church were consecrated according to ancient catholic,

---

the Second Prayer Book containing the Second Ordinal which came into use on the Feast of All Saints, 1552. For details of Anglican deviations from Roman usage see W. K. Firminger, "The Ordinal," in Liturgy and Worship, W. K. L. Clarke, editor (London: SPCK, 1932), pp. 626-682; F. Procter and W. H. Frere, A New History of the Book of Common Prayer (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1932), pp. 648-673. Cf. below,

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:333.

and not Roman, custom and practice.<sup>1</sup>

The notable thing about Jewel's assertion that the bishops of the Church of England succeeded their predecessors according to ancient ecclesiastical tradition was that he attached no importance to that kind of succession which was of supreme importance to the Romanists. By citing consecrator and consecrated Jewel easily could have demonstrated to Harding that episcopacy had been retained in England and the apostolic succession preserved, and thus proved the legitimacy of the Anglican Church on Rome's own grounds. But this line of argument and proof for Anglican catholicity he ignored, and rather showed that apostolic succession, which he acknowledged was the possession of the English Church, was no guarantee of the authenticity of a Church. He recalled to Harding that the Scribes and Pharisees in Jesus' day had claimed to be in legitimate succession from Abraham, but Christ had said to them: "'This did not Abraham.' You are not the church, you are of your father the devil."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Cf. Luther, "Twenty-Seven Proposals for Improving the State of Christendom," in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, Vol. I, pp. 141-142.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:993; John 8:40, 44; cf. Apology, Works, III:104

The Prophet "Micheas," in Old Testament times, had said of those priests and prophets who professed to be of the Lord, but were not: "My priests teach for reward, and my prophets prophesy for money; and yet they rest themselves upon the Lord and say, Is not God in the midst of us?"<sup>1</sup> The bishops of Rome claimed to be the direct successors of Peter, but, Jewel observed: "They have been Arians, Nestorians, Monothelites, and otherwise found in horrible heresies."<sup>2</sup> To Jewel it was plain that "the faith of Christ . . . goeth not always by succession."<sup>3</sup>

It was equally apparent to the Bishop, because of what had been done in the Church of Rome which held the ancient succession, that the English Church could not depend on this succession since it had proved useless to the Roman Church in preserving proper doctrine and faith. If succession had been efficacious in preserving truth, then the Anglican Church would have

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:993; Micah 3:11.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:610.

3. Ibid.; cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, p. 31.



thought more highly of this practice and the doctrine which it expressed, for

. . . if it were certain that the religion and truth of God passeth evermore orderly by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession, whereof he (Harding) hath told us so long a tale, a very good substantial argument of the truth.<sup>1</sup>

Indeed, Jewel affirmed, the contrary was true:

Christ saith: by order of succession, "the scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' chair." Annas and Caiphas, touching succession, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eleazar. Of succession St Paul saith to the faithful at Ephesus: "I know that after my departure hence ravening wolves shall enter, and succeed me. And out of yourselves there shall (by succession) spring up men speaking perversely."<sup>2</sup>

This proved conclusively to Jewel that the pope had no more "due (true) succession and continuance" from St. Peter, in spite of direct "apostolic succession," than the Pharisees had from Moses.<sup>3</sup> Speaking of these religious leaders of Jesus' day, the Reformer added: "Nor did they universally and in all points teach the true meaning of Moses' law; nor did Christ will the

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:322.

2. Ibid.; Matthew 23:2; Acts 20:29; parenthesis is Jewel's.

3. Jewel, op. cit., III:323; parenthesis mine.



people universally and absolutely to obey them. So much this maketh for your succession."<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer was convinced that the Roman Church had insisted so strongly on the doctrine of apostolic succession as being necessary for the Church, that she had neglected essential doctrines, and had substituted succession for truth. This, he asserted, was what Harding's holy succession had come to: "Though faith fall, yet succession must hold; for unto such succession God hath bound the Holy Ghost."<sup>2</sup> Jewel was not blinded by such perverse claims, but believed that "God's grace is promised to a good mind, and to any one that feareth him, not unto sees and successions."<sup>3</sup> That which was important to the Church of England was not succession, but the Word of God, "as Saint Paul saith: 'faith cometh (not by succession, but) by hearing; and hearing cometh (not of legacy or inheritance from

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:323.

2. Ibid., III:347.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:1066.

from bishop to bishop, but) of the word of God."<sup>1</sup> It was on the basis of the absolute authority of the Scriptures that the Bishop had rejected the claims of apostolic succession and had substituted a succession of faith, originating in the Word:

Therefore we think it better to examine and try the grounds of your religion by the word of God, that is one, and uniform, and endureth for ever, than by your touch of Rome, that is so uncertain and so mutable, and so often hath deceived us. St Cyprian saith: "If we would return to the head and original of the heavenly tradition," which is the word of God, "all human error giveth place."<sup>2</sup>

This negative attitude toward succession as a legitimate proof of the authenticity and catholicity of a Church was necessitated by the Apologist's negative attitude toward the Roman Church. If Jewel had asserted that the basis for the orthodoxy of the Church of England was a proper succession through the sacrament of ordination from consecrator to consecrated, then he would have had to acknowledge that the Roman Church was an equally orthodox Church of Christ, and there

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:348; Romans 10:17; parentheses are Jewel's. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:II:3.

2. Jewel, op. cit. IV:1047; Cypriani, "Epistola ad Pompeium Contra Epistolam Stephani," X, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1181-1182.

would have been no justification for the Anglican separation from Rome. Apostolic succession was so closely identified with, and had been so perverted by, the Roman Church that Jewel refused to admit any truth in claims that it was the criterion by which a Church's catholicity could be judged. The English Church, though maintaining this succession as <sup>3</sup>surely as the Roman Church, did not depend upon, or count as important, this mechanical "place taking" for her position as a true Church.

#### A. LEGALITY OF ANGLICAN SUCCESSION

It should be noted here just what Jewel meant to convey in his affirmation that the bishops in the English Church were in proper succession of place. Various claims have been made, citing Jewel's works as support, by those wishing to prove that the Anglican Reformers regarded apostolic succession to be of the utmost importance. A. J. Mason claims that "the great representative Anglican divines (among whom he includes Jewel) have felt that her claim to catholicity was inseparably bound up with the rightful succession of her bishops,"<sup>1</sup> and proceeds to quote Jewel's statement: "Our

---

1. A. J. Mason, The Church of England and Epis-

bishops are made in form and order as they have ever been"<sup>1</sup> in proof of his allegations. A. L. Peck quotes the same words for the same purpose.<sup>2</sup> Apparently these men have failed to realize that Jewel in the quoted statement, and in others, was not defending the position of the Anglican bishops on the basis of apostolic succession, but rather on the grounds of lawful and orderly succession of place.<sup>3</sup> In defending the suc-

---

copacy (Cambridge: The University Press, 1914), p. 23.

1. A. J. Mason, The Church of England and Episcopacy, p. 25; Jewel, Defence, Works, III:334; see above, pp. 211-212.

2. A. L. Peck, Anglicanism and Episcopacy (London: Faith Press, Ltd., 1958), p. 15. This book was written as a reply to Norman Sykes' Old Priest New Presbyter (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), and in it he refutes Sykes' assertion that "for Jewel the touchstone of episcopacy was its soundness of doctrine and its discharge of the work of an evangelist, not its succession of place" (p. 17) by stating: "Jewel explicitly claims succession of place and of sees; and he claims soundness of doctrine in addition to it, not instead of it" (p. 16). From Jewel's words and general attitude it seems that Sykes is correct in stating that doctrine was of primary consideration, and not succession as Peck affirms.

3. H. F. Woodhouse, "What is Meant by Succession?" Theology, Vol. LV, No. 388 (October, 1952), p. 377, states: "Succession for Tudor Anglican divines might mean succession in place or succession in belief . . . The claim was made (for succession of place) that Anglican bishops had never intruded in these times; they lawfully succeeded those who had gone before them." It is interesting to note that since this article appeared, no answer has

cession of the Anglican bishops to the sees in England, the Reformer was answering Harding's accusation that the English bishops had presumed "to take the highest in the church" and were not "duly called thereto;"<sup>1</sup> he was in no way attempting to demonstrate that these places were held legitimately because the occupants were in rightful succession as it was defined by the Roman Church.

### B. THE CONSECRATION OF MATTHEW PARKER

Jewel's position on the legality of the Anglican bishop's succession to their sees was an expression of the prevalent attitude in England in the sixteenth century regarding the lawful position of the Church of England and her clergy. This is clearly seen in the official attitude of the State toward the ordination, consecration, and succession of the English ministry--the particular case in point being the consecration of Matthew Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury.

The consecration of Elizabeth's first archbishop

---

ever been published in the Periodical which contradicts Woodhouse's conclusions.

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, II:321.



is no longer doubted by any serious historian, it being almost universally accepted that on December 17th, 1559, Matthew Parker was made Archbishop of Canterbury in Lambeth Chapel by bishops William Barlow, John Scory, Myles Coverdale, and John Higkins. The "Nag's Head Story" and the question of the consecration of Bishop Barlow, which at one time challenged the validity of Parker's consecration, have been, for the most part, forgotten. However, the question of the validity of Anglican orders has been settled, as far as the Church of Rome is concerned, by the Bull of Leo XIII, "Apostolicae Curae" of September 13th, 1896, which officially denied their validity on the basis of inadequate form and intention.<sup>1</sup> The fact that Parker was duly consecrated

---

1. For further information concerning the "Nag's Head Story" and Barlow's orders see R. W. Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, pp. 210-248; Strype, The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821), Vol. I, pp. 117 ff. Bibliographical material on these subjects is contained in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, F. L. Cross, editor (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), s.v., "Nag's Head Story" (p. 937), "Barlow, William" (p. 131), and "Anglican Ordinations" (p. 54). The most recent discussions about Parker's consecration have centered around the theory that he was consecrated either previous to, or on, October 29th, 1559. This argument is presented by J. C. Whitebrook in his Consecration of the Most Reverend Matthew Parker (London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., 1945). This position is refuted by F. J. Shirley



and the Anglican arguments for the validity of that consecration are not the matters under discussion here. We are concerned with the official attitude toward his consecration and the attitude of the Archbishop himself.

Those involved in the preparations for the consecration, particularly Secretary Cecil and Parker, realized that the consecration would have to take place under the Statute of Henry VIII which prescribed that an archbishop was to be consecrated by either one archbishop and two bishops, or four bishops.<sup>1</sup> Cecil was disturbed about these requirements and complained: "There is no archbishop nor four Bishops now to be had,"<sup>2</sup> probably referring to the absence of four bishops holding sees in England, who evidently in his opinion alone were entitled to consecrate, although the Statute called for only bishops "within this realm." In ad-

---

in his pamphlet Elizabeth's First Archbishop (London: SPCK, 1948). The English text of the Bull of Leo XIII, together with a reply by the Archbishops of England is contained in Anglican Orders (London: SPCK, 1957).

1. 25 Henry VIII C. 20. Text in Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. XII, pp. 201-209.

2. Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 80, note "A".

dition, Parker's explicit instructions that "the order of King Edward's Book is to be observed," was objected to by Cecil on the grounds that the book was never established by Parliament and therefore it was not legal.<sup>1</sup> In order to meet these objections, and others which might arise, the Letters Patent granted by the Queen was concluded by the now-famous "Supplentes Clause:"

Supplying nevertheless by our supreme authority royal, of our mere motion and certain knowledge, if any thing be or shall be wanting, either in the things, which according to our aforesaid commandment shall by you be done, or in you or any of you, by reason of your condition, state, or power, to perform the premises; anything I say, required or necessary in this behalf, either by the statutes of our kingdom, or by the ecclesiastical laws, the circumstance of time, or the necessity of things requiring it,<sup>2</sup>

---

1. The Prayer Book had been authorized by Edward's First Act of Uniformity, 2 & 3 Edward VI, C. 1 (Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXIX, pp. 358-366), and the Second Prayer Book and Ordinal by the Second Edwardine Act of Uniformity, 5 & 6 Edward VI, C. 1 (Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXI, pp. 369-372). Mary's First Act of Repeal, I Mary, Statute 2, C. 2 (Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXIII, pp. 377-380) repealed these Acts, which in turn were restored by Elizabeth's Act of Supremacy, I Elizabeth, C. 1 (Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXIX, pp. 442-458) without any mention being made of the Ordinal.

2. Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 108.

From the wording of this clause it is evident that Elizabeth's chief concern was with the legality of the consecration as far as the laws of the Realm were concerned, but the precaution was also taken that if there was anything lacking in the "condition, state, or power" of the consecrators, it too was supplied by the "supreme authority royal."<sup>1</sup>

In 1563 almost the same criticisms as those voiced by Cecil and Parker were presented, but this time by a Roman Catholic, Bonner, the deprived Bishop of London, refused to take the Oath of Supremacy before Bishop Horne of Winchester, claiming, among other things, that Horne was "not lawful Bishop of Winchester, according to the laws of the Catholic church and the Statutes and Ordinances of this realm (and) . . . was not elected, (and) consecrated . . . according to the canons of the Catholic church."<sup>2</sup> By this Bonner meant that the Ordinal which had been used for the consecration of Parker and all subsequent Bishops had specifically been included in Mary's Act of Repeal, and though the

---

1. This clause was included in all Letters Patent until 1566 when it became unnecessary through the enacting of 8 Elizabeth C, 1 which sanctioned the use of the Ordinal.

2. Strype, Annals, I:II:5 ff.

Prayer Book had been restored, the Ordinal had not been included.<sup>1</sup> This Ordinal did not specify that the Holy Ghost was received in the consecration of bishops, and the whole ceremony was not carried out in accord with Roman usage. Therefore, both the laws of the land and the traditions of Western Christendom had been ignored. The result was, according to Bonner, an illegal and inadequate Ordinal, used by bishops whose consecration was illegal if not invalid, to create more bishops in name only.<sup>2</sup>

Since Bonner's position reflected on both the Queen's Letters Patent and on the clergy of the Church<sup>3</sup> measures had to be taken to rectify the situation. This action did not come until 1566 when Parliament passed "An Act declaring the making and consecrating of the archbishops and bishops of this realm to be good, lawful and perfect," and which in part read:

---

1. See above, p. 224, note no. 1.

2. See Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. VI, pp. 29 ff.

3. Strype, Annals, Vol. I, Part II, pp. 230-231.

Whereupon our said sovereign lady the Queen's most excellent majesty, being most justly and lawfully invested in the imperial crown of this realm, with all authorities, pre-eminences and dignities hereunto appertaining, and thereby having in her majesty's order and disposition all the said jurisdictions, power and authorities over the state ecclesiastical and temporal, as well as causes ecclesiastical as temporal, within this realm and other her majesty's dominions and countries, hath by her supreme authority . . . caused divers and sundry grave and well learned men to be duly elected, made and consecrated archbishops and bishops . . . her majesty, by her supreme power and authority, hath dispensed with all causes or doubts of any imperfection or disability that can or may in any wise be objected against the same . . . all acts and things heretofore had, made or done by any person or persons, in or about any consecration, confirmation, or investing of any person or persons . . . to the office or dignity of any archbishop or bishop within this realm . . . by virtue of the Queen's Majesty's letters patent since the beginning of her reign . . . (shall be considered) good and perfect in all respects . . . any matter or thing . . . contrary thereof in any wise notwithstanding.<sup>1</sup>

This Act ended with the pronouncement that all persons who had been consecrated archbishop or bishop since the beginning of the reign were declared truly to be bishops and legally hold their office, "any lawful statute, law, canon, or any other thing to the contrary notwithstanding."

---

1. 8 Elizabeth Cap. 1. Text in The Statutes of the Realm, Vol. IV, pp. 484-486.



The concern that is evidenced in the "Supplementes Caluse" and 8 Elizabeth Cap. 1 is that the consecration of Parker and the Anglican bishops be lawfully performed according to the statutes of the realm rather than that they be consecrated according to ancient catholic custom with the proper rite by men in unbroken apostolic succession. Elizabeth's presumptuous claim that she could supply whatever might be lacking, not only in the legality of the consecrations, but also in the validity of the consecrators or the adequacy of the Ordinal, indicates that there was little interest in proceeding according to tradition which had never granted the prince such rights. It is noteworthy that though the "Clause" was used frequently, there is no record of its having been objected to by any of the Reformers on the grounds that it was incompatible with Scripture or ancient Christian custom.

Some have yielded to the temptation to read into the Elizabethan Settlement an attitude toward episcopacy and succession which, though true of Anglican divines of a later century, was apparently not in the minds of the Elizabethans. Thompson states that



all the care taken in the preparations for Parker's consecration prove that

. . . Elizabeth deliberately chose to perpetuate the Catholic idea of the ministry by paying the most minute attention to securing the transmission of the heritage of the apostles by means of the method which had descended from the primitive age of the Church; building it, it is true, to the requisites of an 'Erastian' age, but preserving--and this is the fundamental point--the idea of the episcopate as the Essential Ministry of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Florence Higham expresses the same view, but in more guarded terms: "It was continuity that Parker and the Queen both wished to stress."<sup>2</sup> Even H. F. Woodhouse claims that "these Anglican divines did not regard the position of the episcopal office as a matter for the ruler to decide."<sup>3</sup>

If continuity and the perpetuation of the "Catholic" view of the ministry was the definite purpose of Elizabeth and Parker, it is logical to assume that this would have been explicitly stated in the doc-

---

1. B. M. Hamilton Thompson, "The Post-Reformation Episcopate in England," in The Apostolic Ministry, K. E. Kirk, editor, p. 397; cf. p. 406.

2. Florence Higham, Catholic and Reformed (London: SPCK, 1962), p. 7.

3. H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, p. 135. See below, p. 451, note no. 1.

uments responsible for the establishment of the Church, in the preparations for Parker's consecration, and in any defense made of it in the years immediately following. But such is not the case. An examination of the documents of the Elizabethan period reveal both an absence of any reference to the divine establishment of episcopacy and its necessity for the constitution of a true Church of God; whereas there is a conspicuous emphasis on the Church of England being lawfully established according to the statutes of the realm. C. S. Meyer, after considering the Elizabethan Settlement in detail, concluded that

. . . neither Matthew Parker nor the queen nor others were concerned that he be consecrated in "Apostolic Succession." He was consecrated by bishops because of the dignity of the office, not because of the necessity of keeping a direct continuity. . . . In a letter to Dr. Nicholas Heath and other deprived bishops Parker defended the reformed faith of the Church of England and recounted its Scriptural and orthodox basis, but nowhere mentioned that he was a lawful archbishop because of following in apostolic succession.<sup>1</sup>

This opinion is supported by Strype's description of

---

1. C. S. Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1552 (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, 1960), pp. 82-83. Parker's letter is in Correspondence of Archbishop Parker, pp. 109-113, written March 26th, 1560.

Parker's own recollections of his consecration. That which impressed the Archbishop was that the consecration had involved no "spot or stain of Popish superstitions and vain ceremonies." There had been no "gloves nor rights, nor sandals nor slippers, nor mitre nor pall; but more chastely and religiously." Strype's most revealing comment on the Archbishop's memory of the event was that the whole ceremony had been performed "according to the purity of the Gospel; (and) by four Bishops, according to the law in this case."<sup>1</sup>

Thus, in affirming that the bishops of the Church of England succeeded their predecessors "in form and order as they have ever been," Jewel followed the "party line" that the establishment of the Anglican Church had been lawfully and orderly accomplished.

Yet care must be taken not to place too much significance in Jewel's position regarding the legal establishment of the reformed Church. It is true that orderly settlement of ecclesiastical matters by the secular authority was of the utmost importance both as an indication of the unity of Englishmen on religious

---

1. Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 122.

questions and as the lawful expression of Christianity in the land, but for the Reformer the faith of the Anglican Church was not orthodox, nor the sees of the Church rightly held because of legal sanction. It was possible for an individual to be the lawful possessor of a diocese and yet not be a legitimate bishop before God if he lacked true faith and doctrine. From the time of the Roman Catholic domination of the English Church such had been the position, but in his controversy with Dr. Cole the Bishop declared that the Roman clergy were no longer in legitimate possession of that which they had once claimed, and called them "Possessores malae fidei."<sup>1</sup> To this Cole responded:

When ye meddle with law, ye shew your skill. I am still in possession of all that I ever taught; and if you put me out of possession by force, I ought to be restored. Had not the priests in the old law good title to sit in Moses' chair? What! ye forget yourself: yes, perdy, The law accounted no man "malae fidei possessorem," after that he had continued in possession an hundred years.<sup>2</sup>

As far as Jewel was concerned this line of argument was entirely irrelevant since the length of time a see had been occupied by a man of a certain doctrinal per-

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:49.

2. Cole, Letter to the Bishop of Sarum, Works, I:49.

suasion meant nothing if the possessor did not hold the orthodox faith of Christ. The law that accounted no man "possessorem malae fidei" who had continued in possession one hundred years was a civil law, and where the truth of God was at stake the law of God always had precedence over the law of man. Since the Anglican Church had received the truth of God those who held positions in England because they received them through the succession of the Roman Church could be dismissed, for in the words of Augustine: "After the truth is once found out, let custom give place unto the truth. Let no man set custom before truth and reason; for reason and truth evermore put custom to silence."<sup>1</sup> Following Christ, Who was Truth, was more important than adherence to the human traditions which Rome had designed to perpetuate her errors, of which reliance on successions of possessions was a major part. St. Gregory was summoned to support this position:

If ye lay custom for yourself, ye must remember that Christ saith "I am the way, the truth, and the life:" he saith not, I am custom. And doubt-

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:49; Augustine, Decretum Gratiani (Lugduni: 1613), Prima Pars, Dist. VIII, Can. iv, Col. 24.



less any custom, be it never so ancient, never  
so common, yet it must needs yield to the truth.<sup>1</sup>

## II. SUCCESSION OF DOCTRINE

It is evident that Jewel and his fellow Reformers rejected the traditional Roman doctrine of apostolic succession as that on which the true Church of Christ depended. But with what was it replaced? The answer was given in terms of Christ, the early Church, and the Scriptures, an anticipation of which was in Jewel's controversy with Cole. Through the Roman misuse and perversion of succession it had become necessary for the Anglican Church to seek the source of the Church: Her Lord had made known through the Scriptures. Citing the words of Cyprian as justification for the actions of the English Church, Jewel affirmed:

If the pipes of the conduit, which before ran with abundance, happen to fail, do we not use to search the head? &c. The priests of God, keeping God's commandments, must do the same; that, if the truth have failed in any point, we return to the very original of our Lord, and to the tradition of the gospel, and the apostles; that there hence we may take the discretion of our doings, and from whence the order itself and original first began.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:49; Gregorius (VII), Decretum Gratiani, Prima Pars, Dist. VIII, Can. v, Col. 24.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:350; Cypriani,



Jewel thus indicated that he believed succession to be a convenient method of conveying something which was of far greater importance than the agent itself. If succession, which was merely a means to an end, had failed to carry truth and right doctrine, which was its purpose, then it was necessary to abandon it as a means, and returning to the Source which that succession claimed, advocate that true succession which was pure faith in Christ.

This concept was expressed in Jewel's agreement with Harding's assertion that "succession is the chief way for any christian man to avoid antichrist, if" the Reformer added, "you mean the succession of doctrine,"<sup>1</sup> The Roman Church was wrong and did not have proper succession, not because their succession of place and position was always faulty as it was defined by the doctrine of apostolic succession, but because she had fallen from the truth of the Gospel and had left the doctrine of Christ. Speaking to his opponent he de-

---

"Epistola ad Pompeium Contra Epistolam Stephani," X, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1181-1182. See above p. 218, below, pp. 377-379.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:348; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:4; Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, pp. 30-31.

clared: "The doctrine of Christ this day, M. Harding, succeedeth your doctrine, as the day succeedeth the night; and the light succeedeth darkness; and as the truth succeedeth error."<sup>1</sup> If succession of place was to determine orthodoxy and faith, then it was logical that "by succession the Turk this day possesseth and holdeth the four great patriarchical sees of the church . . . By succession Christ saith desolation shall sit in the holy place; and antichrist shall press into the room of Christ,"<sup>2</sup> Jewel dismissed claims to catholicity through succession from antiquity, together with other purely Roman innovations, with the comment: "I trow ye would prove, by this ascent and descent, that God the Father made holy water, and said mass."<sup>3</sup> He summarily stated his position, and that of his Church: "It is not sufficient to claim succession of place: it becometh us rather to have regard to succession of doctrine."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:339.

2. Ibid., III:348; Matthew 24:15.

3. Ibid., IV:784.

4. Ibid., III:349. In this same context in the Defence Jewel states: "We will grant somewhat to succession," which leads Kenneth Carey to believe that Jewel "is not unwilling to grant succession," and states that, while Jewel repudiated "the Pope's claims to the absolute

In considering the succession of right doctrine as one of the primary bases for the Church of England's claim to catholicity, Jewel made explicit that which implicit in his defense of the Anglican Church. Both Roman and Anglican agreed that the early Church was a valid Church, though the Reformers regarded her as normative, their Roman opponents regarded her, in many ways, as rudimentary. The Bishop declared that since the doctrinal tenents held by the Church of England were the same as those held by the primitive Church, she truly succeeded the pure apostolic Church.

### III. SUCCESSION OF WORK

Despite Jewel's insistence on lawful filling of sees, and a succession of right doctrine, he believed that these were not sufficient grounds for a Church in proper succession to the apostolic Church of Christ; he believed that a succession of pastoral work and diligence

---

and unique right of succeeding St. Peter," he did not repudiate the entire doctrine of apostolic succession. "Episcopacy in the Works of Elizabethan and Carolinian Divines," in The Historic Episcopate, p. 66. However, the context of Jewel's words makes clear that he was making no reference to apostolic succession as Carey understands it, but rather to a succession of right doctrine and of episcopal ministerial work.

was also necessary.

The Bishop maintained that the office of a bishop was not one of divine right through consecration; it was one of function and labor. "Surely," he said, "the godly say that, as your bishops do no part of a bishop's duty, and therefore indeed are no bishops at all."<sup>1</sup> This responsibility of a bishop included an obligation to "preach," dispense God's mysteries, "do the part of an evangelist,"<sup>2</sup> and unless these duties were properly performed, "bishop" was only a hollow title.<sup>3</sup> In the before-mentioned letter to Simler, Jewel assured his friend that the Church of England, unlike the Roman Church, required her "bishops to be pastors, labourers, and watchmen."<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:207; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:v:13; IV:vii:23-30; Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon I, p. 29.

2. Jewel, op. cit., IV:675.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:970, Defence, IV:972.

4. Jewel, Works, IV:1221; see above, p. 212. To He commented to Simler that to aid this diligence to duty: "The wealth of the bishops is now diminished and reduced to a reasonable amount, to the end that, being relieved from that royal pomp and courtly bustle, they may with greater ease and diligence employ their leisure to attending to the flock of Christ." For an interesting

It is significant that Jewel, in listing the duties of a bishop, did not feel that there was any necessity to include any which had come to be regarded as the particular responsibility of this office. The Reformer considered the work of the ministry to be a unity, and that succession was not limited to the episcopate, but applied to the work of the lower clergy as well.<sup>1</sup> The office of a bishop was one of supervision, pastoral oversight, and dignity, but it was not one of divine appointment on which the ministry depended. Bishops had specific responsibility for ordination and confirmation, but these were responsibilities granted him by ancient ecclesiastical custom; there was no theological justification for the performance of these functions by those holding the episcopal office.<sup>2</sup>

The supreme example of the abuse of apostolic succession was the office of bishop as it was fulfilled

---

account of Jewel's own mode of living while Bishop of Salisbury, see W. M. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, pp. 64-79.

1. Cf. H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, p. 95; J. P. Hickinbotham, "The Doctrine of the Ministry," in The Ministry of the Church, Stephen Neill, editor, pp. 39 ff.

2. Cf. above, pp. 175 ff.



by the bishop of Rome. The authority claimed by the Roman Pontiff was rejected by Anglicans, not alone for doctrinal and historical reasons, but also on practical grounds. "To be Peter's lawful successor," Jewel stated, "it is not sufficient to leap into Peter's stall. Lawful succession standeth not only in possession of place, but also, and much rather, in doctrine and diligence."<sup>1</sup> The pope, continued the Reformer sarcastically, was certainly Peter's successor if the Apostle

. . . Peter . . . never taught the gospel, never fed the flock, took away the keys of the kingdom of heaven, hid the treasure of his Lord, sat him down only in his castle in St John Lateran, and pointed out with his finger all the places of purgatory and kinds of punishments; . . . gave order to say private masses . . . mumbled up the holy service with a low voice, and in an unknown language; . . . hanged up the sacrament in every temple and on every altar and carried the same about with him withersoever he went. . . . with lights and bells . . . or (sat) . . . in his chair, with his triple crown full of labels, with sumptuous and Persian-like gorgeousness, with his royal sceptre, and his diadem of gold.<sup>2</sup>

Despite the fact that the pope was, through consecration and possession of place, the successor of Peter, Jewel declared:

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:201.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:104; cf. Luther, To the Ruling Class, in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, pp. 125-126.



Except he do his duty as he ought to do, except he minister the sacraments, except he instruct the people, except he warn them and teach them, we say that he ought not of right once to be called a bishop, or so much as an elder. For "a bishop," as saith St Augustine, "is a name of labour, and not of honour; that the man that seeketh to have pre-eminence, and not to profit, may understand himself to be no bishop."<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer's conclusion was that "unless the popes do the like now-a-days, as Peter did the things afore-said, there is no cause at all why they should glory so of Peter's name and of his succession."<sup>2</sup>

Harding realized that what Jewel was saying about the actions and moral character of an individual in relation to his position as a bishop or priest was not unlike Wyclif's theory of "Dominion." He called the Reformer's attention to the fact that the Council of Constance had condemned Wyclif's proposition that "none is a temporal lord, none is a prelate, none is a bishop, so long as he is in deadly sin," as heretical.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:308; Augustini, De Civitate Dei, in Opera Omnia, Liber XXX, Caput XIX, Vol. VII, Col. 647.

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:104.

3. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:308; Concilium Constantiense, Sessio VIII (4 maii 1415), "Sententia condemnatoria articulorum Ioannis Wicleff," Sent. 15, in Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, p. 388.

Wyclif believed that all lordship, both temporal and spiritual, came from God, but this could be properly exercised only as long as the holder remained in a state of grace and fulfilled his responsibility. A Christian held authority, he claimed, only while he remained a servant under God. In contending that "as your (Roman Catholic) bishops do no part of a bishop's duty . . . (they) are no bishops at all," Jewel arrived at approximately the same conclusions as Wyclif.<sup>1</sup>

Though Jewel would never have given a second thought to having disagreed with a decision of the Council of Constance, he nonetheless was caught in a dilemma. On the one hand he stated, as Wyclif had done before him, that a minister's actions which were a reflection of his moral character, somehow affected the effectiveness of his ministry. Yet on the other hand

---

1. See Wyclif, De Civili Domino, edited for the Wyclif Society by Reginald L. Poole (London: Wyclif Society, 1885), Cap. II, p. 20, Cap. XXXV, pp. 253-255. Jewel acknowledged that his views were similar to those of Wyclif, but did so with hesitation and often with qualification, e.g.: "If Wicliffe, upon just zeal for the house of God, for that he then saw the bishops either knew nothing, or did nothing, or cared for nothing, either spake or meant more than truth may bear, we defend it not." Defence, Works, III:309.

he was careful lest he limit the power of God in a rigid and mechanical way as the Roman Church had done. This dominating concept of the absolute sovereignty of God led him to affirm that the sinfulness of a minister did not negate the efficacy of the sacraments he administered, nor did the heresy of the Church of Rome preclude true believers within her. The subjective nature of the office of a bishop was stressed by the Reformer in order to show the inter-relation between faith and practice; between the name, honor, and dignity of a bishop and his calling to serve and minister under God. Jewel did not deny that God could and did work through the most sinful of men--his desire was to demonstrate that a bishop had been called to a work, and unless that work was sincerely performed, the office was one of name only, and attendant titles and claims were mere pretenses at holiness. He could not understand how it was possible for a pope to claim the chair of Peter and yet be so unlike him in manner of life and performance of duties. Because of the unrighteousness and immorality of many of the popes,<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:702.

it was clear to him that "neither is the pope in anything like St Peter, nor was St Peter in anything like the pope;"<sup>1</sup> consequently the Roman assertion that "the Pope receiveth his holiness (by succession) of his chair" was absurd.<sup>2</sup> The mere occupation of a bishop's chair was no assurance that the grace of God would be operative through the individual, for Jewel observed: "Grace is promised to a good mind, and to anyone that feareth him, not unto sees and successions."<sup>3</sup> The Church of England did not depend on the chairs of her bishops to make their occupants holy, since

. . . it is not the chair that maketh the bishop; but it is the bishop that maketh the chair. Neither is it the place that halloweth the man; but it is the man that halloweth the place . . . They are not always the children of holy men that sit in the rooms of holy men.<sup>4</sup>

Jewel's claim to the catholicity and validity of the Anglican Church rested not upon a succession

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1070.

2. Ibid., III:324. Parenthesis is Jewel's.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:1066.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1070. This is a quotation from Jerome. See Decretum Gratiani, Prima Pars, Distincto XL, Canon 2, Col. 194.

that was conveyed by bishop consecrating bishop on the authority of the pope, but upon the succession of truth through right doctrine taught by men who followed in the tradition of the true pastoral ministry of Christ and the apostles. The Reformer may be said to hold that the Church of England's catholicity was bound to "rightful succession" only if what is meant is a lawful succession of place, the holding of right doctrine as handed down from the ancient Church, and the performance of pastoral responsibility. Southgate's observation that for Jewel "rightful succession lay therefore in the possession of right doctrine which had no need of a continuous institution to make it valid"<sup>1</sup> is accurate, and is confirmed by a statement, quoted previously, which Jewel made in response to Harding's accusation that the Church of England had no true bishops:

Therefore we neither have bishops without church, nor church without bishops. Neither doth the church of England this day depend on them whom you often call apostles, as if our church were no church without them. They are no apostles, M. Harding: that is rather your own name, and of good right belongeth unto you. They are for

---

1. W. M. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, pp. 196-197.



a great part learned and grave and godly men, and are much ashamed to see your follies. Notwithstanding, if there were not one neither of them nor of us left alive, yet would not therefore the whole church of England flee to Lovaine.<sup>1</sup>

#### IV SUMMARY

Since it is extremely difficult, when dealing with such topics as the ministry, the episcopate, and apostolic, properly to distinguish one from the other and yet show their proper relation, a word of summary in regard to these concepts, as held by Jewel, is in order.

Jewel defended the ordering of the Anglican Church by deacons, priests, and bishops on historical instead of theological or Scriptural grounds. Episcopacy he believed to be the ancient form of Church government, and as such it was retained, but only in its pure primitive form together with its spiritual

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:335. This statement, and Jewel's entire emphasis throughout his works, contradicts the following conclusion made by Kirk in reference to the sixteenth century English Reformers: "It was to the bishops, and the bishops alone, that by divine ordinance and Catholic custom certain essential and unique apostolic powers had fallen, of perpetuating their own ministry, with the inevitable corollary that, though the presbyters shared with the bishops the power to administer the sacraments and various pastoral function, yet they were expressly excluded from the authority to



oversight and ministry, with all medieval Roman superstitions, dominion, and practices rejected, Apostolic succession, as it was interpreted by the Roman Church, was rejected by Jewel as a method of insuring the catholicity of the Church. The reason given for this repudiation was utilitarian as well as theological; it had proved to be of no use in the Roman Church since it had not prevented her from falling into error.

Jewel did admit that there was a succession from the apostles which the Church of England esteemed most highly and adhered to tenaciously. Christ had commissioned His apostles to preach the Gospel; therefore those who would be their successors would follow them in this work. The orthodoxy of the Church was not to be judged by whether the clergy had been properly ordained and consecrated according to Roman doctrine by men possessing transmitted and transmittable divine power, but by whether the doctrine they proclaimed was the same as that preached by the apostles.

---

constitute in themselves that essential body of persons without which there could be no Church." K. E. Kirk, editor, The Apostolic Ministry, p. 40.

In addition, to follow in the succession of the original apostles involved a continuation of their work of pastoral oversight and care. The Reformer believed that there could be no division between doctrine and practice. If true belief was held, then righteous works would ensue; the former was the source of the latter, and the latter was the confirmation of the former. It was not enough to sit where the apostles had sat; it was also necessary to do what they had done.

True apostolic succession for Jewel was expressed in believing what the apostles had believed, preaching as they had preached, and shepherding the people of God as they had done.

In affirming that the bishops in the Church of England succeeded their predecessors lawfully and orderly, Jewel meant exactly that. The English bishops assumed their chairs according to the laws of the realm, without strife or conflict with the God-ordained rulers. The Bishop's attitude on the legality of the Anglican prelates was an expression of the view obtaining in official ecclesiastical and governmental circles.

## CHAPTER VII

### THE NON-ROMAN CHURCHES

Much thought has been given to, and many books written about, the relations between the Anglican and the non-episcopal Churches on the Continent in the days of the Reformation and in subsequent centuries, together with the attitudes of many of the leading English divines. These have either been concerned with showing that the Church of England always regarded the non-episcopal Churches as incomplete or faulty since they contained a non-Apostolic ministry through the absence of a legitimate episcopate in proper apostolic succession,<sup>1</sup> or have attempted to show that the English Church originally regarded herself as one with the Protestant Churches of the Reformation, in spite of

---

1. See Edward Denny, The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches (London, SPCK, 1900); Charles Gore, The Church and the Ministry (London: SPCK, 1936); Arthur Haddan, Apostolic Succession in the Church of England (London: Rivingtons, 1869); K. B. Kirk, editor, The Apostolic Ministry; A. L. Peck, Anglicanism and Episcopacy.

the exclusive attitude which developed during later centuries.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's attitude toward the non-Roman Churches on the Continent and in Scotland, especially the Reformed, and those who advocated their doctrines and polity in England, form the substance of this chapter. To facilitate matters, the main subject has been divided into a consideration of (1) the Continental Reformed Churches, (2) the Anabaptists and other like sects, (3) the Puritans within the Anglican Church, and finally, (4) the official attitude of the English Church toward non-episcopal bodies in the sixteenth century.

## I. CONTINENTAL REFORMED CHURCHES

Jewel, unlike many of his successors in the Anglican Church who found it necessary to speak about the Reformed Churches, could speak with authority on Continental matters, having received hospitality at

---

1. See Hensley Henson, The Relation of the Church of England to Other Reformation Churches (Edinburgh: Wm. Blackwood and Sons, 1911); Stephen Neill, editor, The Ministry of the Church; Norman Sykes, The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries (London: SPCK, 1948); Old Priest and New Presbyter; H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology.

the hands of many Reformed leaders during his period of "exile" in Queen Mary's reign. In the city of Frankfort he came in contact with Wittingham and John Knox, more radical reformers who attempted to introduce the Geneva Service of Calvin among the English Congregation with attendant difficulties. From Frankfort, accompanying his friend Peter Martyr, Jewel moved to Strasbourg and there became associated with what Southgate describes as a moderate Anglican congregation.<sup>1</sup> Finally, he and Martyr went to Zurich which was "known primarily for its scholarly activities,"<sup>2</sup> where he remained until his return to England upon the accession of Elizabeth. During these years spent with the Continental Reformers, Jewel had excellent opportunity to become acquainted with their theology, to see their polity in action, and to become apprized of the differences among them. Consequently, when he spoke he did so from knowledge which came from direct association with the Reformers on their home-ground and from the voluminous correspondence which he carried on with them in later years.

---

1. W. M. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 15.

2. Ibid.



Jewel knew nothing of the Anglican Church as a "via media" between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. When identified with the Protestant cause and theology by Dr. Cole, the Reformer did not object, but gladly took his place among the Reformed.<sup>1</sup> If Jewel is to be identified with any middle way, it would be with the position between the extremes within the Church of England: a position between the more revolutionary Protestants on the left such as Whittingham, Goodman, Humphrey, and Sampson and the conservative position on the right as personified in the Queen and Archbishop Parker. Jewel, although differing with some Reformers both in the Anglican and in the Continental Churches, recognized the solidarity of the Reformed movement and the all-important need for unity among the Protestants against their common foe, the Roman Church.

The Bishop acknowledged that the Church of England and the Reformed Churches on the Continent and in Scotland were one in faith and doctrine. In writing to his friend and former host, Peter Martyr, just one month after his return to England, he assured the Zurich

---

1. D. Cole, Letter to the Bishop of Sarum, Works, I:26,

Reformer that "we have exhibited to the queen all our articles of religion and doctrine<sup>1</sup> and have not departed in the slightest degree from the Confession of Zurich."<sup>2</sup> Three years later, on February 7th, 1562,

---

1. These Articles to which Jewel referred were the Twenty Articles probably written by the Anglican representatives at the Westminster Disputation, March 31st, 1559, which formed a transition between the Forty-Two Articles issued in 1553, (text in E. C. S. Gibson, The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England (London: Methuen and Co., 1896), Vol. I, pp. 70-89) and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Elizabethan Settlement. A summary of the Twenty Articles is in Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. V, pp. 107-115. These Twenty Articles were mentioned by Edwin Sandys in his letter to Matthew Parker of April, 1559: Correspondence of Archbishop Parker, p. 66.

2. Jewel to Peter Martyr, April 28th, 1559, in Works, IV:1208. Jewel here referred to the "Consensus of Zurich" or the "Consensus Tiguranius" which was "the formula of faith agreed upon in May 1549 by J. Calvin and G. Farel representing the Protestants of French Switzerland, and H. Bullinger . . . representing those of German Switzerland." Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v., "Consensus Tigurinus," p. 332. This formulation, consisting of twenty-six Articles, dealt with mainly the doctrine of the eucharist, and defined it in Calvinistic terms. The text of the "Consensus" is in H. A. Niemeyer, Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum (Lipsiae: Julii Klinkhardt, 1846), pp. 191-217. After reviewing Jewel's doctrine of the Eucharist, G. W. Dugmore concludes that Jewel "does not go the whole way with Calvin or the 'Consensus Tigurinus,' and talk about Christ's body being present merely in virtue, force or efficacy." The Mass and the English Reformers (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958), p. 231. If Dugmore's conclusion is valid, then Jewel's statement in his letter to Martyr is even more significant than appears on the surface, for it shows his desire to identify the reformation in England with that on the Continent,

he again wrote to Martyr attesting to him that "as to matters of doctrine, we have pared every thing away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth."<sup>1</sup> In answer to Harding's accusation that divisions existed among the Reformed Churches, the Bishop answered: "God be thanked, we agree thoroughly together in the whole substance of the religion of Christ, and altogether with one heart and one spirit do glorify God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>2</sup> Jewel regarded the Reformation movement, in which he included the Church of England, as a force united on essentials, although geographically and politically separated.

When Jewel spoke of the individual Reformers of

---

and evidences his willingness to overlook any minor differences which might have existed.

1. Jewel to Martyr, Works, IV:1247. The Bishop was not alone in his recognition of the unity between England and the Continent. On December 13th, 1563, Bishop Horn wrote to Bullinger: "We have throughout England the same ecclesiastical doctrine as yourselves," Zurich Letters, I:135. Bishop Grindal wrote to Bullinger on August 27th, 1566: "We most fully agree with your churches, and with the confession (the Second Helvetic) you have lately set forth," Ibid., p. 169.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:434.

his own day, or of another generation, it was always with the greatest admiration and respect. Luther and Zwingli, in his opinion, were "godly and zealous men, . . . appointed of God."<sup>1</sup> Wyclif, Huss, and Waldo he referred to as "godly men,"<sup>2</sup> and the Church of England, he claimed, had no cause to be ashamed of such men as Jerome of Prague and Berengar of Tours.<sup>3</sup> Calvin, the Reformer stated, was a "reverend . . . father and (a) worthy ornament of the Church of God."<sup>4</sup> His loyalty to, and his dependence on, Martyr and Bullinger is well testified to by his letters to them on matters concerning the English Church over a period of twelve years. The Church of England was one with the Reformed Churches of Zurich, Geneva, Frankfort, Strasbourg, and Wittenberg, and the Anglican Reformers felt a common bond with Reformers of all generations who taught the truth of God in opposition to superstition and unscriptural beliefs and practices.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:213.

2. Ibid., III:161.      3. Ibid., III:214.

4. Ibid., III:370.

5. See George F. Bridges, The Oxford Reformers, pp. 260-266. The esteem in which the Continental Re-

Yet Jewel's desire to demonstrate to the Roman Church the unity of the Reformed community did not blind his eyes to the differences which existed among the Protestant Churches. He was mindful of the disagreements between the Lutherans and Zwinglians on the matter of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the doctrine of Ubiquity,<sup>1</sup> of differences of opinion concerning the propriety of wearing ecclesiastical vestments, and the strife caused by Knox and Goodman through their denunciation of rule by women and the right of subjects to rebel against an ungodly prince.<sup>2</sup> But these the Bishop considered to be chiefly differences about non-essentials which were being resolved,<sup>3</sup> or matters of poor judgment on the part of one or two individuals who were not supported by their

---

formers were held by the great majority of Anglican bishops and leading clergymen is witnessed to by the intimate correspondence which they carried on, which is preserved in the Zurich Letters, Vols. I and II, and in Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation (Cambridge: University Press, 1847).

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:623; see below,

2. Jewel, op. cit., IV:664-665; letter to Martyr in Works, IV:1210

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:623.



co-Reformers on the issues in question.<sup>1</sup> They were, Jewel observed, no greater than the differences which had existed in the ancient Church.

In none of Jewel's correspondence or controversial work is to be found any thought or implication that because a particular Church adhered to different practices or was organized differently than the Anglican Church, she was not a true Church of God and therefore not a sister-Church. The essentials for a valid Church was her preaching of the Word and the proper administration of the Sacraments, according to the Reformer.<sup>2</sup> The autonomy which Jewel claimed for the Church of England against the claims of the Church of Rome, he also granted to other independent Churches. As he insisted upon freedom of action and government for the English Church, so he defended the right of other particular Churches to organize their ministry and determine their own policies and ceremonies as the local situation dictated. That which might prove useful in the Church

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:664-665; letter to Martyr, Works, IV:1210

2. See below, p. 356.



of England might not be advantageous to the Church of Zurich, and conversely, that which was most expedient for the Church of Geneva might be detrimental to the cause of the Gospel in the Anglican Church. The unity which the Church of England felt with the Protestant Churches on the Continent and in Scotland depended on agreement in essential doctrine and in loyalty to Christ as the Head of the Church; it did not depend on a centralized institution with uniformity in polity and practice. Jewel saw in the ancient Churches a prototype for the Protestant Churches of the sixteenth century. Just as the Churches of Ephesus, Constantinople, Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch had enjoyed substantial independence from each other and had regarded each other as equal, yet without departing from the true faith of Christ, so the Churches of England, Geneva, Scotland, Wittenberg, Frankfort, and Zurich, while differing in forms of government and in other non-essentials, could retain their unity, catholicity and oneness in Christ.<sup>1</sup>

An example of his attitude toward Churches with

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:366-367, 439; Defence, Works, IV:376.

which the Church of England might differ on non-essential matters is seen in his comments about the Greek Church. The English Church, Jewel claimed, had much in common with her sister Church in Greece: there was a common abhorance of the domination of the bishop of Rome,<sup>1</sup> each permitted her clergy to marry,<sup>2</sup> each gave communion in both kinds and repudiated the doctrine of transubstantiation,<sup>3</sup> and neither Church held private communion.<sup>4</sup> Jewel affirmed:

They have neither private masses, nor mangled sacraments, nor purgatories, nor pardons. And as for the titles of high bishops, and those glorious names, they esteem them so as, whosoever he were that would take upon him the same, and would be called either universal bishop, or the head of the universal church, they make no doubt to call such a one both a passing proud man, and a man that worketh despite against all the other bishops his brethren, and a plain heretic.<sup>5</sup>

The Reformer recognized that the Greeks had "many things corrupted amongst them," but added: "Hold they still a great number of those things which they received from the apostles."<sup>6</sup> Jewel regarded the Greek

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:740.

2. Ibid., III:157. 3. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:578.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:387.

5. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:384. 6. Ibid.

Church as truly Catholic because she had retained the Gospel, and Anglicans acknowledged her as a true Church of Christ because of agreement on essential doctrines. It is noteworthy that the Bishop did not include among these important things which the English and Greek Churches shared, a similar polity based on apostolic succession and the episcopate.

## II. THE PROTESTANT SECTS

The Protestant extremist groups presented a problem to Jewel and afforded some embarrassment to the general Reformed community. Harding used the Schwenkfelders, Mennonites, and Anabaptists as evidence of disunity among the Protestants, and cited examples of their rebellion and indifference to civil rulers as proof of Protestant irresponsibility, radicalism, and disrespect of authority.<sup>1</sup> Jewel, on behalf of the Anglican Church, denied any association with these sects and stated that the Protestant cause had nothing in common with these revolutionaries, laying the blame for their existence at the feet of the Roman Church with whom, he felt, they had a greater affinity.

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:187-188.

He declared:

Your anabaptist and Zwenkfeldians we know not. They find harbour amongst you in Austria, Silesia, Moravia, and in such other countries and cities where the gospel of Christ is suppressed; but they have no acquaintance with us, neither in England, nor in Germany, nor in France, nor in Scotland, nor in Denmark, nor in Sweden, nor in any place else where the gospel of Christ is clearly preached.<sup>1</sup>

Such, he admitted, had not been always the case in England, but this too he cited as an example of the darkness which accompanied the Roman Church wherever she went. In writing to Peter Martyr in 1560, he said: "We found at the beginning of the reign of Elizabeth a large and inauspicious crop of Arians, Anabaptists, and other pests, which (had) . . . sprung up in that darkness and unhappy night of the Marian times."<sup>2</sup> The coming of the Gospel through the Reformation had brought light, and "like owls at the sight of the sun," these groups had fled and were now nowhere to be found.<sup>3</sup>

These sects were thoroughly disliked and disowned by the orthodox Reformers in England and on the

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:189.

2. Jewel to Martyr, November 6th, 1560, Works, IV:1241.

3. Ibid.

Continent.<sup>1</sup> Jewel called them "monsters,"<sup>2</sup> "heretics," "enemies of the gospel,"<sup>3</sup> and bringers of "pestilent infections."<sup>4</sup> Though these groups denounced the papacy and Roman Doctrines and practices as emphatically as did the English and Continental Reformed leaders, the Reformers believed they had gone too far. The Anabaptist concept of the Church as a gathered group of adult Christians free from outside control was foreign to both Anglican and Continental Reformers, and the Anabaptist emphasis on the personal revelation of the Holy Spirit in each individual together with the absolute right of each person to interpret the Bible irrespective of any authority other than the inner testimony of the Spirit was too radical for the great majority of Protestants. Jewel believed that these sects were

---

1. See Zwingli, Refutation of the Tricks of the Catabaptists, in Samuel Jackson, Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1901), pp. 123 ff.; Bullinger, Decades, Volume V, Sermon VIII, pp. 385-388; Calvin, Psychopannychia, in Calvin's Tracts and Treatises, translated by Henry Beveridge, notes by Thomas Torrance (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958), Vol. III, pp. 413 ff.; Institutes, IV:xii, IV:xvi:10-13.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:603.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:665.

4. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:603.



heretical because they had nothing in common with the early Church, denied legitimate authority, divided the Body of Christ and the unity of the true faith, held false doctrines of the Sacraments, and consequently he pronounced "them for detestable and damned persons and (defied) . . . them even unto the Devil." He continued: "Neither do we leave them so, but we also severely and straitly hold them in by lawful and politic punishments, if they fortune to break out anywhere and bewray themselves."<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. THE PURITANS

Puritanism presented a different problem for the Reformers in England. Though the Puritans formed a group within the Church of England as opposed to the entirely separate Continental, Greek, and extremist Churches about which mention has been made, they may be considered appropriately in the present chapter for it was their desire to model the Anglican Church along the lines of

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:601. See above, note no. 3, p. 161.

the Reformed Church of Geneva. All the Tudor Monarchs of the sixteenth century had to contend with the Puritans to some degree, but it was not until the beginning of the 1570's that they became a force increasingly requiring the attention of the English Reformers. During the first decade of Elizabeth's reign the English Church had devoted her energies to defending herself from the external enemy in Rome, but with the Elizabethan Settlement reasonably well established, Puritanism, and even more formidable foe, began to seriously challenge the "status quo."<sup>1</sup> Jewel's death on September 23rd, 1571, prevented him from taking an active and significant part in the Puritan controversy, and the Anglican Church had to look elsewhere for her defender, eventually finding him in the person of Jewel's former pupil, Richard Hooker.

Nevertheless, Jewel was not permitted to complete his ministry without coming into contact with puritanism's non-conformity; indeed he left several indications of his attitude toward this "reforming" movement. Early in Elizabeth's reign, Jewel actively

---

1. For a thorough treatment of Puritanism in the sixteenth century, see M. M. Knappan, Tudor Puritanism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939).

participated in a controversy arising over ornaments and vestments which were to be used by the clergy, and to which the Puritans were unalterably opposed. In 1573, John Whitgift prepared an Answer to a Certain Libell Intituled An Admonition, &c. which was his response to the Puritan's Admonition to Parliament presented in the preceeding year, in which was expressed, among other matters, the Puritan's disapproval of the Church of England's use of the threefold ministry and ordination and consecration according to the "Pope's pontifical."<sup>1</sup> Included in Whitgift's Answer was a brief paper entitled "Certain Frivolous Objections Against the Government of the Church of England" which, according to Whitgift, was "The Judgment of that reverend father, John, late bishop of sarum, avouched by his own hand."<sup>2</sup> There is little doubt that both Whitgift and Strype<sup>3</sup> are correct in ascribing the authorship of this

---

1. "A View of Popish Abuses," in An Admonition to Parliament, in W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, editors, Puritan Manifestos (London: SPCK, 1907), p. 30.

2. Jewel, "Certain Frivolous Objections," Works, IV:1299-1300.

3. Whitgift, Works, edited for the Parker Society by John Ayre (Cambridge: The University Press, 1852), Vol. II, pp. 337-338; Strype, The Life and Acts of John Whitgift

paper to Jewel. It is reasonable to assume that the Church would turn first to the one who had so ably defended her against the Church of Rome to reply to this new threat to the unity of the whole establishment. Jewel's position as a moderate would enhance any defense of the Anglican Church in the estimation of the Puritans, and Cartwright virtually acknowledged Jewel's authorship in apologizing for his disagreement with one of such "learning and gravity" who had so effectively fought the papists.<sup>1</sup> This work answered four Puritan objections which appeared in the form of statements, and gives us insight into Jewel's belief about the government of the Anglican Church as he defended it, not against his usual Roman Catholic opponents, but against his fellow Protestants who were but advocating a polity which was held by the Genevan Church which he greatly admired and counted among the true Churches of God. Finally, several months before his death Jewel preached a sermon at Paul's Cross against the Puritans as one of a series which the bishops presented in their efforts to subdue the non-conformists. This sermon has not been preserved

---

1. Thomas Cartwright, Reply to Jewel's "Judgement" in Whitgift's Works, Vol. II, p. 377.

in its complete form, but its chief arguments and main gist have been saved for us in an answer which the Puritans drew up and circulated.<sup>1</sup> These writings, dealing as they do with the vital concerns of the Puritans, provide an excellent basis for a consideration of Jewel's intense desire for unity and his defense of the polity and customs of the Church of England.

### THE VESTARIAN CONTROVERSY

The vestarian question had existed in the Church of England since the time of Edward VI, but during the early days of Elizabeth's reign it was one of the chief occasions for Puritan opposition to the established Church. Though the liturgical situation, of which the use of vestments was a part, "was one of utter confusion"<sup>2</sup> between 1560 and 1570, three definite points of view are evident.

The first of these views was expressed by the Queen herself and was manifest in the various Acts passed under her direction relating to liturgy and worship. Elizabeth has been described as a person "fon of shew, jewelry and dress," and one who "liked

---

1. Albert Peol, editor, The Seconde Parte of a Register (Cambridge: The University Press, 1915), Vol. I, pp. 79-80.

2. W. L. Clarke, Liturgy and Worship, p. 164.



crucifixes, images, and the gorgeous display of the Roman hierarchy and ritual."<sup>1</sup> These personal tastes, together with her determination to unite as many of her subjects as possible, determined her liturgical policy, which, although anti-Roman, did not alter radically the traditional forms of worship. By establishing outward uniformity through a broad Church settlement "she hoped in time to wean her Catholic subjects from their old mentality."<sup>2</sup> To this end the Act of Uniformity of 1559 was passed and the Prayer Book revision of the same year accomplished, which effected, with but minor modifications, a return to the religious settlement of Edward VI. The Act of Uniformity required that:

---

1. Philip Schaff, A History of the Creeds of Christendom, Vol. I, p. 597. An example of Elizabeth's conservative nature is seen in her coronation service which was performed in the traditional fashion with the exception of the absence of the elevation, and the Gospel and Epistle were read in English. She retained a cross and candles in her chapel, and on one occasion, after a madman had broken the cross and thrown the candles to the ground, a tapestry on which was a crucifix occupied a place behind the altar until the cross was repaired and replaced. See Dixon, A History of the Church of England, Vol. V, pp. 46-51, Vol. VI, p. 37; Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England (London: Hollis and Carter, 1954), Vol. III, p. 17.

2. J. E. Neale, Queen Elizabeth I (Edinburgh: Penguin Books, 1960), p. 179.

Such ornaments of the Church, and the Ministers thereof, shall be retained, and be in use, as was in this Church of England by the authority of the Parliament in the Second year of the reign of King Edward the VI., until other order shall be therein taken, by authority of the Queen's majesty with the advice of her Commissioners.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, the use of vestments as outlined by the Prayer Book of 1549 was to be adhered to:

In the saying or singing of Matens and Euonsong, Baptizyng and Burying, the minister, in paryshe churches and chapels annexed to the same, shall use a Surples. And in all Cathedral churches and Colloges, . . . Graduates, may use in the quiere, . . . such hoodes as pertaineth to their seuerall degrees . . . But in all other places, euery minister shall be at libertie to use any Surples or no. It is also seemely that Graduates, when they dooe preache, shoulde use . . . hoodes . . . And whensouer the Bushop shall celebrate the holye communion in the churche, or execute any other publique minystracyon, he shall haue upon hym, besyde his rochette, a Surples or albe, and a cope or vestment, and also his pastorall staffe in his hande, or elles borne or holden by his chapeleyne.<sup>2</sup>

This insistance on uniformity in dress and the retention of some of the traditional Roman vestments for the ministers was chiefly political in motive. It

---

1. I Elizabeth Cap. 2 in Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXX, pp. 458-467.

2. "Certayne Notes for the More Playne Explicacion and Decent Ministracion of Thinges, Contained in Thys Booke" of the First Prayer-Book of Edward VI in First and Second Prayer-Books of Edward VI (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., n.d.), p. 288.

was the Queen's policy to allow enough reformation to satisfy the large Protestant element in the Anglican Church to retain their support for government policy, but under no circumstances was the reformation of the Church to deviate from those things legally prescribed by the Queen and Parliament.<sup>1</sup> The wearing of the enjoined vestments had no religious significance or doctrinal implications; they were to be worn by the command of those in authority, and any transgression would be counted as treason against the establishment.<sup>2</sup>

The extreme Puritans were obstinate in their opposition to vestments and all ceremonial elements of worship which had Roman Catholic associations. They believed it was impossible for the average man to separate the symbols of religion from the essentials of faith; therefore all traces of "popery" and superstition were to be abandoned as those things with which they were associated had been. As opposed to the Anglican

---

1. See the letter of Elizabeth to Parker of January 25th, 1564 in Parker Correspondence, pp. 223-227.

2. Peter Martyr recognized the political nature of the decision to retain some of the vestments. See Martyr to (Thomas Sampson?) of February 1st, 1560, in Zurich Letters, II, pp. 38-41.

attitude that many practices were permissible in the Church if not forbidden by the letter or spirit of the Scriptures, the Puritans believed that only those things commanded in the Word of God should be allowed in public worship. Even though many Puritans would have agreed, if pushed to the extreme, that the matter of wearing or not wearing vestments, or even the surplice, was a thing indifferent on religious grounds, there was also involved the matter of its having been required by the authorities, which they believed was an imposition into the rights of the Church and her ministry. They were so convinced of the rightfulness of their position in refusing to wear the vestments that they were willing to suffer deprivation:

And if the Prince shall take in hand to command us to do any of those things which God hath not commanded, in such sort that we may not leave them undone unless we will thereby run into the penalty of the law we, (when we shall see that in doing thereof we cannot edify but destroy) we must then refuse to do the thing commanded by the Prince and humbly submit ourselves to suffer the penalty, but in any case not consent to infringe the Christian liberty which is to use things indifferent to edification and not to destruction.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. "A Briefe Discourse Against the Outward Apparell and Ministering Garmentes of the Popishe Church," quoted in Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, p. 198.

The Puritans reasoned that if, as the government said, vestments were things indifferent, it would make no difference if they were discarded, for the use of such garments in the Church was evidently doing more harm than good.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel occupied a middle ground between these two groups--at times supporting the Queen's position, and at other times affirming the Puritan belief, and yet on occasions affirming both. On November 5th, 1559, he wrote to Peter Martyr about the vestments then in use in the Anglican Church, describing them as "theatrical habits, . . . senic dress, . . . relics of the Amorites," and expressed his desire that "sometime or other they may be taken away and extirpated even to the lowest roots."<sup>2</sup> He assured his friend that "neither my voice nor my exertions shall be wanting to effect that object."<sup>3</sup> Writing again to Martyr in February, 1562, he stated: "Now that the full light of the gospel has shone forth, the vestiges of error must, as far as possible, be removed together with the rubbish,

---

1. For a detailed study of the vestarian problem, see Knappen, Tudor Puritanism, pp. 187-216.

2. Works, IV:1223.      3. Ibid.



and, as the saying is, with the very dust. And I wish we could effect this in respect to that linen surplice."<sup>1</sup> Time brought no moderation in Jewel's views, for even in February of 1566, he related to Bullinger:

The contest respecting the linen surplice, . . . is not yet at rest. That matter still disturbs weak minds. I wish that all, even the slightest vestiges of popery, might be removed from our Churches, and above all from our minds.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel's words will bear no other interpretation than that he thoroughly disapproved of the use of the vestments.

Yet the Bishop's belief about vestments as stated in his numerous letters to his friends on the Continent was seemingly contradicted by his actions and efforts in his diocese of Salisbury. Henry Machyn, in his diary for March 17th, 1560, recorded that the sermon preached before the court on that day was delivered by Jewel, attired "in ys rochett and chymmer."<sup>3</sup> The rochet, cope, surplice, square cap, tippets, and

1. Works, IV:1247.

2. Ibid., IV:1268.

3. Henry Machyn, The Diary of Henry Machyn, p. 225. Though both the First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI prescribed that a bishop should wear a rochet, the Chimere, which was the outdoor dress of the bishop, is nowhere mentioned in any rubric. See above, p. 269.

long gowns were among those vestments cited by the Puritan party as having been borrowed from the Papists.<sup>1</sup> Soon after he began his duties as Bishop, Jewel "recognized" the statute regarding cope money for the Cathedral, an act which indicates that he supported the continued use of the cope in his diocese.<sup>2</sup> In 1565, when Bishop Horne, with the consent of Archbishop Parker, preferred Humphrey, Jewel's friend, former companion in exile, and future biographer, to a benefice in Salisbury, the Reformer refused to accept him on the grounds of his obstinacy and failure to comply with the law of the Church in his refusal to wear the surplice. In a letter to Parker, Jewel stated:

I would gladly admit (him) . . . in respect of his learning, yet in respect of this vain contention about apparel I have thought it best to make a stay, until I might further understand

---

1. See a letter from Laurence Humphrey and Thomas Sampson to Henry Bullinger, July, 1566, in Zurich Letters, I, p. 164.

2. C. Wordsworth, Statutes and Customs of the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Salisbury (London: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd., 1915), p. 355. Southgate (John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 71) states that "this statute provided that the bishop should give twenty pounds or a cope of the same value to be employed in the church. Similarly, the dean, the other officers and the archdeacons, certain prebends and canons of the cathedral, were to give in varying amounts. The money . . . was not to be used for any

your grace's pleasure. Unless your grace shall otherwise advise me by your letters, without good assurance of his conformity I mind not in any wise to receive him. Saving your grace's judgment, it were expedient that the matter were generally over-ruled. This long sufference breedeth great offence.<sup>1</sup>

There is an apparent inconsistency in Jewel's practice about the wearing of the traditional vestments. On the one hand he stated quite definitely that he was not in favor of them, but on the other hand insisted on their being worn by the clergy under him, and by him himself. This problem was resolved in the Reformer's mind by considering the relative merits of personal opinion about matters indifferent, and the official policy of the Queen and the stated law of the Church and realm.

Jewel disliked the vestments because of their association in the minds of the people with "popery," the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, and all the corruptions of the Roman Church, yet he recognized that

---

other purpose than the purchase of copes. Jewel's was the first ratification of the statute since its original inception and the only one until it was again ratified by Seth Ward in 1672."

1. Jewel to Parker, December 22nd, 1565, in Works, IV:1265; see Strype, Parker, Vol. I, p. 369.

the apparel was not evil in itself and could not be considered either "holy" or "unholy." It was his contention that they had been "fouly abused to filthy purposes" by the Church of Rome.<sup>1</sup> Since they had been thus used and had become the cause of much offence, they should be discarded just as St. Augustine's mother had ceased to bring "wine and cakes to the Church, not for that it was ungodly or unlawful of itself so to do, but," Jewel pointed out, "only for that she was warned it was a resemblance of the superstition of the heathens."<sup>2</sup> The Bishop's position becomes more evident when we consider his answer to Harding's accusations and derisions on the disunity that was evident in the Church of England over the matter of clerical apparel:

Do not some among you wear square caps, some round caps, some button caps, some only hats; do not some wear side gowns having large sleeves with tippets, which is not well liked of your sect, some of more perfection Turkey gowns, gaberdines, frocks or nite gowns, of the most lay fashion, for avoiding of superstition? . . . The thing is indifferent, and may be yielded to, saith the one sect; they be the pope's rags, and may not be worn saith the other sect.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:616.

2. Ibid.; Augustinus, Confessionum, Liber VI, Caput II in Opera Omnia, Tom. I, Col. 719-720.

3. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:612.

To this Jewel responded:

The godly-learned men, at whose persons it pleaseth you so rudely to scoff, that refuse either to go in your apparel, or otherwise to shew themselves like unto you, have age sufficient, and can answer for themselves. Notwithstanding, thus much I may say in their behalf: Neither do they commend any manner of apparel as holy, nor do they condemn any apparel as unholy. That is your proper and peculiar error, M. Harding, to make so deep account of outward shews.<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer was opposed to the use of vestments, even the surplice, but he was even more opposed to the Roman Catholic position that looked upon them as holy, and to the Puritan position within the English Church that denounced them as unholy. He never lost sight of the fact that the wearing or non-wearing of the vestments was itself a thing indifferent and non-essential to the Church and therefore not a matter of faith.

The reason for Jewel's condemnation of the Roman position on the use of vestments is apparent and understandable, but his personal wearing of the hated apparel and his opposition to individuals who put into practice the beliefs he himself held is somewhat less evident, but of great importance. This problem was solved for the Bishop by again considering the relative

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:615.



merits of personal opinion about matters indifferent, and the policy of his Sovereign and the law of his Church. Though Jewel was opposed to the wearing of the apparel which was so closely identified with the papacy, he was not willing to sacrifice the whole work of the Reformation by opposing the program of the establishment and defying authority because of a matter which was relatively unimportant. The wearing of the vestments might be a matter of indifference, but the respect for the authority which required their being worn was not; consequently the key to the situation is found in his loyalty to the Queen and her government on which the success of the whole Reformation in England was dependent. In 1566, he wrote: "The queen at this time is unable to endure the least alteration in matters of religion,"<sup>1</sup> and again in the following year he observed: "The queen is resolved not to be turned from her opinion."<sup>2</sup> Even though he could sympathize with those who endeavored to rid the Church of England of the "relics of the Amorites," he condemned them

---

1. Jewel to Bullinger, February 8th, Works, IV:1268.

2. Jewel to Bullinger, February 24th, ibid., IV:1272.

for their attitude that "the whole of our religion were contained in this single point," and disagreed with those who thought the matter so important that they were willing rather to "lay down their functions, and leave their churches empty, than to depart one tittle from their own views of the subject."<sup>1</sup> Jewel's attitude is clearly expressed in Grindal's letter to Bullinger of August 27th, 1566, in which, speaking for the Bishops of the Anglican Church he affirmed:

We who are now bishops, on our first return, and before we entered our ministry, contended long and earnestly for the removal of those things that have occasioned the present dispute; but as we were unable to prevail, either with the queen or the parliament, we judged it best, after a consultation on the subject, not to desert our churches for the sake of a few ceremonies, and those not unlawful in themselves, especially since the pure doctrine of the gospel remained in all its integrity and freedom; . . . And we do not regret our resolution; for in the meantime, the Lord giving the increase, our churches are enlarged and established.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel believed the Puritans were right in their desire to abandon every "vestige of popery," but they were wrong to threaten the whole state of the Church of England because of such a matter as clerical apparel. Bin-

---

1. Jewel to Bullinger, February 24th, 1567, Works, IV:1272.

2. Grindal to Bullinger, August 27th, 1566, in Zurich Letters, I, p. 169.

doff come to the crux of the problem and concisely shows how this one point concerning an "indifferent" matter might undermine all that the Reformation had gained:

From refusing to wear a surplice it was not far to denying the power of a bishop to enforce such a thing, and from that to denying his authority altogether; and to deny the authority of a bishop was really to deny the authority of the Crown which appointed him and gave him his orders.<sup>1</sup>

Such insubordination in the Church was intolerable to the Bishop. The fact that the Continental Reformed Churches had discarded the vestments was irrelevant, even though their actions might have been envied. Their right to determine their own policy was respected and their advice sought, but their example could not be followed if the welfare and unity of the Anglican Church would be impaired.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. S. T. Bindoff, Tudor England (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1961), p. 228.

2. The Continental Reformers had been asked for their opinions on the question of vestments, and though there was some indecision on the part of Martyr, they generally urged moderation, and agreed that the matter was one of indifference. See Bullinger to Horne, November 3rd, 1565, in Zurich Letters, I; pp. 341-344; Bullinger to Humphrey and Sampson, May 1, 1566, in ibid., pp. 345-355; Bullinger and Gaultier to Humphrey and Sampson, September 10th, 1566, in ibid., pp. 360-363; Martyr to

## OBJECTIONS TO EPISCOPACY

Jewel again encountered Puritan opposition when he undertook to answer the four Puritan "objections" which appeared in Whitgift's Answers, made chiefly against the office of the bishop. The first "objection" stated that the pattern of the Church as it was outlined in the fourth chapter of Ephesians was perfect, and in that pattern there was no mention of pope, archbishop, or deacon. The second claimed that the synagogue of the Old Testament was a model for the Church to follow. The third "objection" was scholastic in nature, to the effect that where the substance of anything is perfect the accidents are also bound to be perfect, and that the substance of true religion was perfect in the primitive Church, yet there was no archbishop. Finally, objection was made to the confounding together of the civil and ecclesiastical government into one person, for, it was stated, the civil power cannot be exercised by any ecclesiastical person.<sup>1</sup>

---

(Sampson?), July 15th, 1559, in ibid., II, pp. 25-27; Martyr to (Sampson?), November 4th, 1559, ibid., pp. 32-33; Martyr to (Sampson?), February 1st, 1560, ibid., pp. 38-41.

1. Certain Frivolous Objections, Works, IV: 1299-1300.

In answering these Puritan objections, which their proposers believed reflected the teaching of the Reformed Church of Geneva, Jewel first defended the right of any Church to originate offices when the situation indicated that they were needed for the proper ecclesiastical government. He replied to his opponents by denying that there was a perfect pattern indicated in the fourth chapter of Ephesians because, he asserted, "we have neither apostle, nor evangelists, nor prophets; and yet are they the chief in that pattern;" conversely, the Church possessed the offices of bishop, presbyter, deacon, "catechista," and "lector" which were "necessary parts in ecclesiastical government," yet were not mentioned in this fourth chapter.<sup>1</sup> In order properly to minister to the people, the Church had not only a right, but a duty to establish public churches, pulpits, schools, and universities, all of which were beneficial, but none of which were mentioned in Ephesians. At one time, Jewel observed, there had been no king of Israel or duke or earl in England, yet these were legitimate positions, just as were those of

---

1. Certain Frivolous Objections, Works, IV:1299.



dean, parson, and prebend which existed in the sixteenth century Church, but were unknown in the primitive Church. Thus the Bishop affirmed his belief in the prerogative of the Church to create offices and positions which had no counterpart in the Scriptures or for which there was no precedent in the early Church in order that the needs of the day might be met and provision made for the ever increasing ministry of the Church. To the fourth objection the Reformer answered that both the civil and ecclesiastical office had been confounded in Moses, and the priests of Israel had judgment and government over the people.<sup>1</sup> On the basis of proper discipline, a topic popular among the Puritans, and the examples of St. Paul and St. Augustine, Jewel stated that ecclesiastical officials could wield civil authority, yet without elaboration.<sup>2</sup>

The general theme of Jewel's sermon preached at Paul's Cross in 1571, has been preserved for us under the title: "Certaine griefes justly conceived of Bishop

---

1. Certain Frivolous Objections, Works, IV:1300.

2. Ibid.; I Timothy 5:1; Possidius, Vita Sancti Augustini, Cap. XIX, in Operum Augustini (Lugduni: 1586) Tomus X, no pagination.

Jewells sermon, with a brief answer to some parte therooft, written by W. W. and drawne into forme by T. W."<sup>1</sup> It is plain from the Puritan's "griefes" that Jewel's main concern was for the unity of the English Church and the necessity for the non-conformist's acceptance, not only of the "wheat," but also being willing to tolerate a bit of the "chaff" which the Reformation had been unable to remove from the Church. Jewel defended the use of the words: "Receive the Holy Ghost" in the service of ordination, in such a way that the Puritans stated that such arguments as Jewel employed "might be used by the Papists" themselves.<sup>2</sup> In addition, much to the Puritan's dismay, the Reformer upheld the vestments worn by the clergy as "the good creatures of God."<sup>3</sup> After commending Jewel for "defendinge Christs Church against the open papist," the Puritans summarized what they believed the Bishops position to be in the following words:

Our (the Puritan) common error at this day is, that sith by our godly prince (whome God preserve) and bishops, such good hath bene done

---

1. According to Peel (The Seconde Parte of a Register, Vol. I, p. 79), these initials are probably those of William White and Thomas Wilcox.

2. Peel, The Seconde Parte of a Register, Vol. I p. 79.

3. Ibid.

to Christs Church in England, for which all true Christians are and ought to be thankfull, therefore we must allow and receive in the service of God whatsoever thei command.<sup>1</sup>

The uncompromising Puritans found it impossible to appreciate Jewel's apparently compromising position and his differentiation between things essential and indifferent. They could not understand a man who had at one time defended the Church so ably against the Roman enemy and who now supported many of the errors he had condemned previously. These non-conformists failed to realize that the Bishop had not changed his position or his allegiance; he was not conducting virtually the same battle, but on a different front. His constant theme against the Roman Catholic Church had been the unity of the Anglican Church and her adherence to those doctrines which were necessary for a true Church of Christ. As he had condemned the Romans for breaking the unity of the catholic Church by usurping the place of Christ and imposing false doctrines and unnecessary practices, so he turned against the Puritans for their impairing the solidarity of the reformed Church through their bickering about non-

---

1. Peel, The Seconde Parte of a Register, Vol. I, p. 79.

essential matters.

In defending the Church of England against the Puritans, Jewel struck some notes that echo several of the arguments which Harding had used in his apology for Roman Catholic practice and doctrine. The Reformer, in opposing the non-conformists, found himself supporting the Church of England in her continuation of such an unscriptural office as that of archbishop, and such a purely Roman practice as the use of vestments. But we are not to suppose that because of his evident change of attitude, he had forsaken his basic Protestant principles. Jewel was a moderate in temperament, and though the establishment did not always conform to his exact standards of a truly reformed Church as exemplified in the Continental Reformed Churches which he respected and regarded as sister Churches of Christ, he came more and more to the realization that the Queen would not be moved from her conservative position, and that the best would have to be made of the situation. As long as nothing was done contrary to the Scripture, Jewel, for the sake of the unity he had endeavored to demonstrate so forceably to the Roman Catholics, supported Elizabeth's measures against the Puritans who

threatened the health of the Church by insisting on issues which in themselves were not vital.

It will be noted that in Jewel's treatment of the Puritans there was no mention that the vestments, which they opposed, were retained in the Church of England for any but reasons of expedience, and there was no criticism of those Churches in other parts of the world which had discarded them. The Reformer, in denouncing those who would impose the presbyterian polity of Geneva or Scotland on the Anglican Church, never denounced that polity as wrong or unscriptural, and never condemned any Church which was so ordered. The fact that Jewel fought those who would defy authority by abandoning the vestments and reorganizing the Church was no reflection on those Churches which had accomplished what the Puritans desired. It was in a reflection of Jewel's conviction that each national Church had a right to determine her own polity and customs, and that as long as basic Christian doctrine was held, matters indifferent, despite personal feelings, were not worth pursuing if the unity of the Church was in jeopardy.



## V. THE OFFICIAL ATTITUDE

There is little question that Jewel defended the official position taken by the Church of England in the vestarian controversy and in the conflict over the organization of the Church. It is equally clear that he regarded the Reformed Churches of the Continent and Scotland, which had discarded the vestments and adopted a presbyterian system of government, as true Churches, united with the Anglican Church in faith and doctrine, and one with them in opposition to Roman domination. Yet the question arises, in this belief did Jewel reflect the official attitude of the English Church during his lifetime, or was his view different from that of the establishment and the majority of Anglican ecclesiastical leaders? We now turn to a consideration of this question.

The reformation of the Church of England had many things in common with the reformation of the Churches on the Continent, but because of the political situation in England, the Anglican Reformation tended in a more conservative direction. Whereas the Continental Reformation was led largely by men in com-

paratively insignificant positions, both ecclesiastically and politically, the Reformation in England was effected by bishops in places of authority with the support of the prince and Parliament. Within the English Church, since the cause of reformation was carried through by the efforts of the prelates, there was never any serious question,, except Puritan attempts after the establishment under Elizabeth had been planted, of a reorganization of the ministry and the abolition of the institution of the episcopacy as had occurred on the Continent. The Church of England had been, and would continue to be, a Church with an episcopacy for "there was no good reason for proceeding without it."<sup>1</sup>

The difference in the historical circumstances between the Reformation in England and on the Continent was recognized by the Anglican Reformers of the sixteenth century, and due account taken. The adoption by the Reformed Churches of a presbyterian form of government was acknowledged by the English divines to be a necessity, but such deviation from the traditional episcopal

---

1. F. J. Taylor, "The Post-Reformation Episcopacy," in The Ministry of the Church. Stephen Neill, editor, p. 76. See Philip Schaff, A History of the Creeds of Christendom, Vol. III, p. 605.

government was not regarded as an invalidation of the ministry of those Churches so organized. Richard Hooker stated that although

. . . some do infer, that no ordination can stand but only such as is made by bishops, which have had their ordination likewise by other bishops before them, till we come to the very apostles themselves; . . . we answer, that there may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop . . . in case of such necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath oftentimes, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued succession of bishops in every effectual ordination.<sup>1</sup>

This view led him to conclude, regarding the non-episcopal Churches in Scotland and France, that

. . . inasmuch as both of these are fallen under a different kind of regiment; which to remedy it is for the one altogether too late, and too soon for the other during their present affliction and trouble; this their defect and imperfection I had rather lament in such case than exagitate, considering that men often times without any fault of their own may be driven to want that kind of polity or regiment which is best, and to content themselves with that, which either the irremediable error of former times, or the necessity of the present hath cast upon them.<sup>2</sup>

Though believing that except in "cases of inevitable necessity . . . none may ordain but only bishops,"<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Richard Hooker, Works, Book VII, Chapter XIV, Division 11.

2. Ibid., Book III, Chapter XI, Division 16.

3. Ibid., Book VII, Chapter XIV, Division 11.

Hooker admitted that at times God Himself raised up those "whose labor he useth without requiring that men should authorize them, but then he doth ratify their calling by manifest signs and tokens of himself from heaven."<sup>1</sup> Hooker based his position, and what he believed to be the position of the Anglican Church, on his understanding of the difference that existed between things "necessary" for salvation as those which were contained in the Word of God or could be "manifestly collected out of the same,"<sup>2</sup> and those which were "accessory" and not based upon, or contained in the Scriptures.<sup>3</sup> Thus Hooker, "the most accomplished advocate that Anglicanism has ever had,"<sup>4</sup> believed that government by episcopacy was best, but that it alone was not the apostolic ministry, and therefore exclusive. Church order was necessary, but there was no one kind which was sanctioned by Scripture and consequently requisite for a catholic Church and ministry.<sup>5</sup>

---

1. Hooker, Works, Book VII, Chapter XIV, Division 11.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, F. L. Cross, editor, s.v. "Hooker, Richard," p. 654.

5. Hooker, op. cit., Book III, Chapter I, Division



Archbishop Whitgift arrived at the same conclusions as did Hooker and supported him in his clash with the Puritans. Against the Puritan assertion that the only order of Church government allowable by the warrant of Scripture was presbyterianism, the Archbishop retorted:

That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the church cannot be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny; and the reasons that move me so to do be these: the first is, because I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the scriptures of the Church of Christ; which

---

14; Chapter II, Division 1. Both J. L. Ainslie from the Reformed side, and A. J. Mason from the Anglican side, show that this "plea of necessity," which was used by Hooker and others, but not by the Continental or Scottish Reformers, is basically unfounded. That there were bishops both on the Continent and in Scotland who joined the ranks of the Reformers is commonly accepted, and it is difficult to imagine those Anglican bishops in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, many of whom had first-hand knowledge of Continental affairs, not knowing of such individuals who, if the Lutheran and Reformed Churches had so desired and thought unnecessary, could have performed ordinations and consecrations according to the traditional method. Jeremy Taylor, writing in the seventeenth century, was acquainted with such persons who had joined the ministry of the Reformed Churches. See Taylor's Works, edited by J. Keble (London: Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans, 1893), Vol. VII, pp. 138-143. The "plea of necessity" is only valid if it refers to circumstances not obtaining in other Churches which were true in England where there was cooperation between ecclesiastical and civil authorities. See J. L. Ainslie, The Doctrine of Ministerial Order, pp. 206 ff; A. J. Mason, The Church of England and Episcopacy, pp. 512 ff.



no doubt should have been done, if it had been a matter necessary unto salvation of the church. Secondly, because the essential notes of the church be these only; the true preaching of the word of God, and the right administration of the sacraments . . . notwithstanding . . . some kind of government may be a part of the church, touching the outward form and perfection of it, yet is it not such a part of the essence and being, but that it may be the church of Christ without this or that kind of government, and therefore the 'kind' of government' of the church is not 'necessary unto salvation.'<sup>1</sup>

The force of both Hooker's and Whitgift's argument against presbyterian objections to episcopacy lay in the claim that ecclesiastical order was not a part of the Gospel, and therefore could not be a test of the authenticity of any Church. However much they may have disagreed with the Puritan claim of unique Scriptural authority for presbyterianism, they never defended their own form of government on the same exclusive grounds which would have resulted in an unchurching of the non-episcopal Churches on the Continent.

This desire on the part of the leaders of the Anglican Church to demonstrate their unity with other Churches in spite of their different polity or practices is also found in the XXXIX Articles of Religion when

---

1. John Whitgift, Works, Vol. I, pp. 184-185.

reference is made to the Church. Article XIX defined the Church as "a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance," without mention being made of polity or ministry.<sup>1</sup> In like manner Article XXIII asserted that a man ought to be lawfully called to the ministry and concluded that "those we ought to judge lawfully called and sent, which be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given unto them in the Congregation, to call and send Ministers into the Lord's vineyard" without specifying that "public authority" of those who called and chose. Article XXIV, "Of the Traditions of the Church," recognized that as long as nothing was done contrary to God's Word, it was "not necessary that Traditions and Ceremonies be in all places one, and utterly alike," and claimed that "every particular or national Church hath

---

1. For the origin and purpose of the XXXIX Articles, see Charles Hardwick, History of the Articles of Religion (London: George Bell and Sons, 1876), pp. 391-419; Neil and Willoughby, The Tutorial Prayer Book, pp. 545-572. Article XIX was based on Article VII of the Augsburg Confession, and Article XXIII on Article XIV of the same Confession. See below, p. 355, note no. 1.

authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church, ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

In conformity to her own standards, the Church of England chose to perpetuate that episcopal form of government which she had held in pre-Reformation days. This persistence is expressed in the official statements of the Tudor Church. She affirmed her position in Article XXXVI, "Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers," and in the "Preface to the Ordinal." According to Article XXXVI, "the Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament" was that which was to be used in the ordering of ministers in the Anglican Church since it contained "all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering," and, in harmony with the Church's purpose of having nothing repugnant to the Scriptures, the Book should not be thought to contain anything "superstitious and ungodly." The "Preface to the Ordinal" declared that since the threefold ministry of deacon, priest, and bishop had existed since the apostles' time, it was the intent of the English Church that

"these orders may be continued and reverently esteemed."<sup>1</sup>

After considering the above statement of the Church, Norman Sykes concludes that

. . . if these Articles be read in the light of the preface to the Ordinal it is legitimate to interpret them also as affirming the resolve of the Church of England to continue the traditional threefold ministry and to maintain episcopal ordination and government. But the absence of any statement concerning the doctrinal significance of episcopacy is noteworthy.<sup>2</sup>

Similarly, Bishop Hunkin calls attention to the fact that in these formulations "there is no note of attack upon the Reformed Communions on the Continent which had not retained the historic episcopate. On the contrary, the note is one of defence."<sup>3</sup>

1. In 1662, the ending of the first paragraph of the Ordinal was changed from: "It is requisite that no man (not being at this present Bishop, Priest, nor Deacon) shall execute any of them except he be called, tried, and examined, and admitted according to the form hereafter following," to: "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination." See Neil and Willoughby, The Tutorial Prayer Book, pp. 506-507.

2. Norman Sykes, The Church of England and Non-Episcopal Churches, p. 7.

3. J. W. Hunkin, "The Anglican Patterns of Epis-

In 1571, over the Queen's objections, Parliament passed "The Subscription Act"<sup>1</sup> which some have regarded as a definite denial on the part of the English Church of Continental Reformed orders. This Act required

. . . that every person under the degree of a bishop, which does or shall pretend to be a priest or minister of God's holy word and sacraments, by reason of any other form of institution, consecration, or ordering, than the form set forth by Parliament in the time of . . . King Edward VI, or now used in the reign of our most gracious sovereign lady . . . shall . . . declare his assent and subscribe to all the articles of religion, which only concern the confession of the true Christian faith and the doctrine of the sacraments.

The circumstances under which this Act was passed indicate that its purpose was to establish uniformity and enforce conformity to the Articles among the clergy who had come into the Church of England with Roman ordination and consecration and therefore would not have been ordained according to "the form set forth by

---

copacy," in The Office of a Bishop (London: Church Book Room Press, Ltd., 1948), p. 26.

1. 13 Elizabeth, Cap. 12 in Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXXIII, pp. 477-480. Elizabeth reluctantly gave her assent to this Act because she believed Parliament was over-stepping its prerogative in forcing the subscription of the clergy. See Denny, The English Church, pp. 39-40; Hardwick, A History of the Articles of Religion, pp. 147-148.



Parliament in the time of . . . Edward VI," and not to judge the ministries of other Churches.<sup>1</sup> This Act reaffirmed the Church's determination to retain a ministry of episcopally ordained men as national policy.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Cf. Hardwick, A History of the Articles, pp. 146-148.

2. Whitgift interpreted this Act as requiring episcopal ordination for undertaking the ministry within the English Church. When Walter Travers asked why it was possible for former Roman Catholic priests to enter the ministry of the Anglican Church without reordination, and why it was not possible for him, being in Presbyterian orders, to do the same, Whitgift answered: "When the like Act is made for his (Travers) Ministry, then he may allege it. But the laws of the realm require that such as are allowed as Ministers in the Church should be ordained by a Bishop and subscribe to the Articles before him." Strype, Life of Whitgift, Vol. III, Appendix, p. 185. Since Travers was an Englishman who had gone abroad deliberately to receive non-episcopal orders, and had consequently incurred the displeasure of the Archbishop, it is interesting to speculate what Whitgift's answer would have been had the individual seeking admission been a native of Scotland, France, or Germany. Despite questions about certain specific cases (see Thompson, "The Post-Reformation Episcopate in England," in The Apostolic Ministry, pp. 406-432; A. J. Mason, The Church of England and Episcopacy, pp. 489-511), it is certain that many were admitted into the ministry of the Anglican Church with Presbyterian orders. See Hooker, Works, Vol. I, p. lxxvi; W. Goode, A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches (London: Thomas Hatchard, 1852), pp. 1-44. This latter work gives a detailed account of official Church attitudes, private opinions from leading Anglican divines, and examples of non-episcopally ordained men who were admitted into the Church of England without reordination.

## VI. SUMMARY

The attitude which Jewel took toward other non-Roman Churches was an expression of the intense feeling of nationalism and independence which had been growing in the countries of Western Europe for several centuries prior to the Reformation, and which in England had been fostered by Henry, Edward, and Elizabeth through their absolute rejection of the authority of the Bishop of Rome within their realm. Both Jewel and the official documents of Church and State affirmed that England was a free and sovereign nation which had the God-given right to determine her own internal policy and customs in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. Among these matters were certain traditions which the Church in England had long held--one of which was episcopal government. These had been kept, together with certain other non-essentials, for the edification of the Church. Though the Reformer personally disliked the use of the vestments which had been retained, he refused to make either their use or non-use a matter of faith and was content to subscribe to them in conformity to the law.

Uppermost in the Bishop's mind was the unity of the reformed Church of England which had been established by law. The Puritans, who would endanger this unity over matters of indifference, were denounced as severely as were the Roman Catholics who had broken the Body of Christ over basic principles of faith. Jewel never lost sight of that important differentiation between matters necessary for a true Church and those merely accessory. The touchstone of such matters was the Holy Scripture. Those doctrines taught, and things commanded therein were to be held; those things forbidden by it were rejected. Where a practice, though not based on Scripture, was not contrary to its letter or spirit, that practice could be retained by a particular Church without offence. This differentiation was more than a convenient means of justification or rationalization for an individual like Jewel who was bound by law to support policies which he personally disliked; it was an absolute necessity since if this law were not enforced, the whole structure of essential doctrines and practices would crumble and the state of religion would be worse than before.

But Jewel's attitude toward other non-Roman

Churches also reflected an internationalism which was based on a common citizenship in God's Kingdom wherever it was manifested on earth. The old internationalism which was based on a mutual allegiance to the papacy was supplanted by a mutual allegiance to the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures. Whereas Churches before the Reformation had been considered Catholic through their obedience to the pope, no matter what their geographical location, the Reformed Churches of the sixteenth century looked upon each other as true branches of the Church catholic because of their common rejection of papal supremacy and acceptance of the essentials of the Christian faith as given in the Word of God. On these grounds the Greek Church, though differing in many respects from the Anglican Church, was accepted as a valid Church, but the Anabaptists and other sects were excluded from the society of catholic Churches because they did not, in the opinion of the leading Reformers, adhere to Scriptural beliefs even though they had also rejected Roman domination.

The right of individual determination in matters of indifference which Jewel claimed for the Church of England he also granted to other national and provincial

Churches. On this basis it was possible for a Church to forbid certain practices within her jurisdiction, while regarding another Church as a sister in the Christian community, even if that Church condoned the forbidden customs. Therefore Jewel, whose views were substantially the same as the official views of his Church, could defend both the episcopally ordered Church of England and acknowledge the presbyterian Churches of the Continent and Scotland as one in faith and doctrine and truly catholic.



## CHAPTER VIII

### THE CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS

The pre-Reformation Church of Western Christendom was a sacramental Church in the fullest possible sense of the term. From the time an individual received the sacred rite of Baptism until he received the Sacrament of Extreme Unction his religious life was largely devoted to the observance of ceremonies, rituals, and practices which if not legally and technically Sacraments, were nonetheless sacramental in nature. The original significance and purpose of the Sacraments and attendant actions were lost sight of eventually, and the average parishioner could see no farther than the mysterious actions of the clergy, which actions, the layman was told, imparted grace and were absolutely necessary for his eternal salvation. The objective efficacy of the Sacraments, expressed in the words "ex opere operato,"<sup>1</sup> in practice depreciated individual

---

1. See Council of Trent, Session VII, "On the Sacraments in General," Canon VIII, in Canons and Decrees.

faith and defined religion to the popular mind in terms of adherence to externals as constituted by the Church. Since the clergy were responsible for the performance of these actions and the administration of the Sacraments on which the laity were dependent, they soon became the personification of the Church and her power.<sup>1</sup> It was easier for the parish priest to go through the accepted, and, by the time of the Middle Ages, often well known and loved practices, without explaining their significance to the ignorant who could neither read nor understand the Latin of the services. Carpenter accurately describes the situation:

In the Middle Ages they (the Sacraments) were the instruments of a dominating clericalism . . . The fact is that Transubstantiation was not maintained solely in the interests of truth, or obligatory confession in the interests of the spiritual good of the parishioners. Both were maintained in the interests of the domination of the priest.<sup>2</sup>

The Sacraments had lost their corporate nature and had become the sole possession of the clergy who used them in a wooden and lifeless way to satisfy the religious

---

1. See Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945), pp. 613 ff.; William Stevenson, The Story of the Reformation (Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959), p. 16.

2. S. C. Carpenter, The Church in England, 597-1688 (London: John Murray, 1954), pp. 185-186.

needs of the laity through their appeal to the people's desire for show and mystery.

The Reformation, in its religious aspects, was a violent reaction against these innovations and corruptions which had been absorbed into the life and worship of the Roman Church, and especially against the mechanical concept of the Sacraments which denied the essence of the Church to be the congregation of God's faithful people and centered it in the clergy. Jewel expressed this Reformed emphasis. In his first apologetic works, his sermons at Paul's Cross and at the Court in 1559, and 1560, he challenged the Romanists mainly on the doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Although the Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanae was wider in scope than the Sermons, the Sacraments nevertheless were a major consideration in this work as well as in his later Defence. Jewel was chiefly interested in the Sacraments "per se," but they are so intricately bound up with the ministry and the Church that they too must be considered when examining his concept of the Church.

In considering the Reformer's doctrine of the Sacraments as it pertains to the Church, attention will be directed to (1) that which he believed constituted a Sacrament, and (2) the relation of the Sacraments to

the elements, the recipient, and the minister.

## I. THE SACRAMENTS DEFINED

Throughout Jewel's thought about the Sacraments is the concept that God as Sovereign over His Church is both Source and Lord of His Sacraments, and as such, used them when and how He pleased. The Sacraments, the Bishop affirmed, had been ordained "not by any prelate, not any prince, not any angel or archangel, but only God himself,"<sup>1</sup> consequently the Church could not do with them as she pleased nor change them from God's original purpose. He recognized that as the Old Testament laws had become a burden to the people by the time of Christ and had thus ceased to fulfill God's purpose, so the Roman Church had so altered the nature of the Sacraments that they too had become a burden for the people to carry. The Church of Rome had

. . . defiled the Lord's sacraments with a multitude of superstitions and childish ceremonies, and have annexed unto the same a deep charge of God's high displeasure, and burden of conscience. They teach the people of God in this sort: O touch not this, O taste not this. They burden the people's consciences . . . Yet would they never, nor yet will they yield, that any one of all their vain ceremonies be released.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:138; cf. Challenge

The Sacraments, he believed, contrary to Roman belief and practice, were creatures "given to us by God to be used freely, without servile observance or subjection of conscience. For God hath appointed these things for us, not us for them."<sup>1</sup>

In order to restore the Sacraments to the simplicity and intention of the Church of Christ and the apostles, it was necessary to reconsider the whole Roman Sacramental system which had existed within the Church in England, and discard all that was not in keeping with the nature of a true Sacrament of the Gospel. This involved arriving at a satisfactory definition of a Sacrament and vigorously applying it to the Sacramental system which had been inherited from the Roman Church.

Jewel realized that he would be on tenuous ground if he were to look to the early Church for a consistent definition of the Sacraments or for an acknowledgment of an invariable number.<sup>2</sup> He admitted that "sacrament"

---

Sermon, I:5-6; Defence, III:338-339.

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:138.

2. See Andre Lagrade, The Latin Church in the Middle Ages, Archibald Alexander, translator (Edinburgh:



was sometimes "used in a general kind of taking, and so every mystery set down to teach the people, and many things, that indeed and by special be no sacraments, may nevertheless pass under the general name of a sacrament."<sup>1</sup> The Reformer therefore turned to the New Testament, and in accord with Reformed usage of the day, defined a Sacrament as that "which Christ hath ordained in the new testament, (for) which he hath chosen some certain elements, and spoken special words to make it a sacrament, and hath annexed thereto the promise of grace."<sup>2</sup> Thus, the only Sacraments which fulfilled all the requirements of this definition were plainly

---

T. and T. Clark, 1915), pp. 32-77. The number of Sacraments was not fixed finally at the traditional seven until the Council of Florence in 1439. See *Councilium Florentiae, Sessio VIII, "Bulla unionis Armenorum,"* in *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, p. 517.

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1102.

2. Ibid.; of. Article XXV of the XXXIX Articles of Religion: "There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. Those five commonly called Sacraments . . . have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God;" Peter Martyr: "(we must) limit the name of sacrament to those things which not only signify spiritual things, but also are practised by certain words, and about which there is extant a precept so to do." Joseph C. McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 135.

in Jewel's mind, Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

An example of a practical application of this definition is Jewel's answer to Harding's question why the Church of England did not regard the ceremony of foot washing as a Sacrament. The Bishop replied: "The washing of feet was neither institution of Christ, nor any part of the sacrament, nor specially appointed to be done by the apostles, nor the breach thereof ever deemed sacrilege."<sup>1</sup> He further explained his position by observing that there was no "special element namely chosen, nor any certain words appointed to make it a sacrament, nor any promise of grace thereto annexed."<sup>2</sup> When this line of thought was applied to the Seven Sacraments of the Roman Church it was evident to the Reformer that "the sacraments instituted by Christ are only two, the sacrament of baptism, and of our Lord's supper, as the ancient learned fathers have made account of them."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:225.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1103. Martyr also used the washing of feet to illustrate an action recorded in the New Testament which

## II. THE REJECTED SACRAMENTS

After affirming the legitimacy of only two Sacraments, Jewel asked a rhetorical question in order to give himself the opportunity to explain his position in relation to the remaining five Sacraments which the Anglican Church had not retained:

Do we refuse confirmation, penance, orders, and matrimony? Is there no use for these among us? do we not allow them? Yes. For we do confirm, and teach repentance, and minister holy orders, and account matrimony, and so use it, as an honourable state of life. We visit the sick among us, and anoint them with the precious oil of the mercy of God. But we call not these sacraments, because they have not the like institution.<sup>1</sup>

We now proceed to these rites which "pass under the general name of a sacrament" to determine their significance in Jewel's doctrine of the Church.

Confirmation, the Reformer claimed, had originally been a ceremony in which the bishop had laid his hands upon the heads of those who had been reared in Christian homes and had come to ratify the profession which had

---

which was not a Sacrament. It was refused by him because "there are given no particular words, which should come to the element to make it a sacrament, and by which the promise of some singular gift of grace to be obtained is declared unto us." McLelland, The Visible Worlds of God, p. 138.

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1103.

been made by others for them at their baptism, and with prayer "commended them unto God,"<sup>1</sup> Confirmation, the Bishop agreed, was "a good ceremony, and well ordained by our ancient fathers," yet it was not a Sacrament because it had not been "commanded by God in express words."<sup>2</sup> The exclusive right of a bishop to administer confirmation was not of divine origin, but was a tradition which the Church of England had retained, never, however losing sight of the fact that the rite had been "devised by man."<sup>3</sup> The significance of Confirmation was not in the use of the sign of the cross or in the anointing with the "oil of salvation," but was in the parental training and rearing in the community of faith which would result in the individual's standing "in knowledge, and in the fear of God, that they might know God and walk before him in reverence and fear, and serve him in holiness and righteousness."<sup>4</sup> The Church was

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1125; cf. Council of Trent, Session VII, Canon I, "On the Sacraments in General," in Canons and Decrees, p. 54.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.

3. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xix:10; Council of Trent, Session VII, "On Confirmation," Canon III, in Canons and Decrees, p. 58.

4. Jewel, op. cit., II:1127. The first and second

that body wherein the Word of God was so taught that a child would be reared to confirm those vows which had been taken for him at his baptism, as opposed to an institution which performed magical rites, thus enabling the receivers to gain entrance into God's Kingdom.<sup>1</sup>

Orders, to which reference has been made,<sup>2</sup> was also repudiated because Christ "did not ordain it to be a sacrament,"<sup>3</sup> and there was no "outward element

---

Prayer Books of Edward VI made it clear what the Church of England believed the significance of confirmation to be. "Hereafter," i.e., as opposed to the previous practice of the Roman Church, none "shall be confirmed, but suche as can say in theyr mother tong, tharticles of the faith, the lordes prayer, and the tenne commandments." To further indicate the necessity of a proper understanding of the Christian faith as a requisite for confirmation, the service was preceeded by a "Catechisme" containing the questions that "the Busshep (or suche as he shall appoynte) shall by his discrecion appose them in." The second Book of Edward VI omitted the signing of the cross in the ceremony of confirmation. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xix:13.

1. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xix:9.

2. See above, pp. 175 ff.

3. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129. Calvin did not include Order among the Sacraments of the Church "because it is not ordinary or common with all believers, but is a special rite for a particular office," Institutes, IV:xix:28. He nonetheless seems to accord it a somewhat higher place among those rites which were non-sacramental than did Jewel.



joined to the word,"<sup>1</sup> Even though the ministry was used of God to make known God's grace through the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, ordination itself gave no grace to the recipient. Instead of divine grace being received by the clergy, they had been committed with the "word of reconciliation."<sup>2</sup>

The rejection of marriage as a Sacrament was not dealt with at length by Jewel because he believed "the matter is known and common."<sup>3</sup> Although Christ had honored marriage by being present at the wedding in Cana, He had not ordained it, for, the Bishop stated, "this fellowship was first ordained of God himself in paradise."<sup>4</sup> Matrimony on the one hand did not impart any special grace, nor on the other was it a state of "uncleanness, filthiness, (or) a work of the flesh,"<sup>5</sup> as was implied in the prohibition against the marriage

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1130.

2. Ibid.,

3. Ibid., II:1128.

4. Ibid.; cf. II:1103

5. Ibid., II:1128.

of the Roman clergy. Indeed, Jewel affirmed: "Marriage is honourable in all men . . . in the patriarchs, in the prophets . . . apostles . . . (and) bishops;"<sup>1</sup> but it was not a Sacrament.

In reference to Extreme Unction the Reformer pointed out that this was a practice which had originated in its basic form in the early Church and was first mentioned by St. James; therefore because it had not been instituted by Christ it was refused as a Sacrament.<sup>2</sup> The Roman Church, Jewel believed, had perverted the original purpose of the ceremony and had erred in believing that the miraculous powers of healing which God had given to the apostles was to endure for all time, because

. . . St James, in saying, "Anoint him with oil," doth not set down an order whereunto he would have the Church of God tied for ever: it is not a universal commandment, that the after ages would do the like; but only a particular ordinance for the time, to use the gift of healing.<sup>3</sup>

Yet, the Church of England did adhere to the ancient

. . . rule of the apostle in visitation of the sick: when any is sick among us, the minister

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1123.

2. Ibid., II:1135

3. Ibid., II:1136.

cometh unto him, and discretely instructeth him in what sort he should prepare himself to depart this life, and so leadeth him to comfort, and laboureth to make him strong in the certain hope of everlasting life.<sup>1</sup>

Rejecting the Roman emphasis on the external ceremony of Extreme Unction and the anointing with holy oil blessed by a bishop, the Anglican Church instructed "all men to live, and to die, and to be in readiness."<sup>2</sup> The sick, through the instruction of the Word, were "anointed with the inner and invisible oil of the mercy of God;" they were "put in mind to have the oil of faith . . . that their lamps may ever be burning."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1137. Jewel in this statement is in harmony with the teaching of the Book of Common Prayer in the "Order for the Visitation of the Sick" and the Council of Trent, Session XIV, "On the Sacrament of Extreme Unction," Canon IV, which interpret "elders" (James 5:14) as "ministers," while Calvin would permit "the elders of the church" rather than the Roman "priestling" to minister to the sick. Institutes, IV:xix:21.

2. Jewel, op. cit., II:1138-1139.

3. Ibid., II:1139. The first Prayer Book of Edward VI provided for unction in "The Order for the Visitation of the Sicke" with the words: "If the sicke person desyre to be annoynted, then shal the priest annoynte him upon the forehead or breast only, making the signe of the crosse, saying thus . . ." This option was not provided in the second Prayer Book or in the later edition of 1662. The proposed Prayer Book of 1928 included in "The Visitation of the Sick" the rubric: "Then shall the Minister say (laying his hands upon the sick person if desired), 'O Almighty God, . . .'"

The practice of Confession was given special consideration by Jewel since in abandoning it as a Sacrament the Church of England had been severely criticized by the Roman Church on the grounds that it was so intricately bound up with the grace of God mediated through the Church, that without it there was no forgiveness of sins, and consequently no salvation. The Council of Trent had spoken of Penance in precise words:

The universal Church has always understood, that the entire confession of sins was also instituted by the Lord, and is of divine right necessary for all who have fallen after baptism: because that our Lord Jesus Christ, when about to ascend from earth to heaven, left priests His own vicars, as presidents and judges, unto whom all mortal crimes, into which the faithful of Christ may have fallen, should be carried, in order that, in accordance with the power of the keys, they may pronounce the sentence of forgiveness or retention of sins.<sup>1</sup>

The promises made by Christ to the apostles and those who follow in their ministry were these:

Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven (Matthew 18:18) . . . and Whose sins you shall forgive

---

1. Council of Trent, Session XIV, Chapter V, "On Confession," in Canons and Decrees, p. 97.

they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained (John 20:23).<sup>1</sup>

The Roman prelates further explained their position by claiming that the forgiveness of sins by a priest was "not a bare ministry," but contrary to the belief of the Reformers, was "after the manner of a judicial act, whereby sentence is pronounced by the priest as a judge."<sup>2</sup> It was not sufficient that the penitent "confide in his own personal faith as to think that, . . . he is . . . truly and in God's sight absolved, on account of his faith alone."<sup>3</sup>

Jewel devoted more attention to Penance than to the other Sacraments which had been rejected by the Anglicans because, whereas Matrimony, Ordination, Confirmation, and Extreme Unction were rites which were generally observed once in each individual's life, Confession had a more important place in the faith of the people since it was a rite which was repeated frequently.<sup>4</sup> The Bishop rejected Penance as a Sacra-

---

1. Council of Trent, Session XIV, Chapter VI, "Of the ministry of this Sacrament, and on Absolution," in Canons and Decrees, p. 100.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.

4. The Lateran Council meeting in 1215 decreed



ment because it "was appointed by some tradition of the universal church (not) . . . by any authority or commandment of the new or old testament,"<sup>1</sup> and because it had "not any outward element joined to the word."<sup>2</sup> Yet this did not mean that confession had no place in the life of the Church of England.<sup>3</sup> Because of the nature of the Roman Catholic attack, Jewel felt it necessary to explain exactly the place confession held in the English Church and its relation to the ministry and the laity.

Contrary to Roman accusations, the Reformer affirmed: "We are taught to lay open and acknowledge our sins, not to hide them, but to make confession of them."<sup>4</sup> He recognized three types of confession to be Scriptural: "The first made secretly to God alone, the second openly before the whole congregation, and

---

that a Confession was to be made to a priest at least once a year. See Concilium Lateranense IV, Const. 21, in Concilliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, p. 221.

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1134; Decretum Gratiani, "Tractatus De Poenitentia," Causa xxxiii, Distincto V, Col. 1801.

2. Jewel, op. cit. II:1103

3. See above, pp. 154 ff.

4. Jewel, op. cit. II:1133.

the third privately unto our brother."<sup>1</sup> The confession of sins which was made to God was the most important and the sincerity and earnestness of this confession determined the effectiveness of the confession made before men which Jewel described as being helpful "if it be well used."<sup>2</sup> The knowledge of God's forgiveness after a sincere confession of sins could only come through a knowledge of the Word of God, and the statement of the fact of God's forgiveness could be given either by a minister,<sup>3</sup> or by a fellow Christian layman.<sup>4</sup>

Philip Hughes, a contemporary Roman Catholic historian, in discussing Jewel's concept of confession and penance, takes exception to the Reformer's position and voices virtually the same criticism which was leveled at the Anglican divines in the sixteenth cen-

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:351. In another place Jewel referred to only two kinds of confession: "Either in the secret thought of thy heart before God, or else in the hearing and presence of men." A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1133. Cf. Calvin, Institutes, III:iv:8-14.

2. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1133.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:360; cf. Calvin, Institutes, III:iv:13; see above, pp. 154 ff.

4. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1133; see above, pp. 167 ff.

tury. He declares: "Nowhere is there any hint of a belief that the penitent's 'greater comfort' lies in the knowledge that the one to whom he has confessed his sins has forgiven them by his priestly authority and power," and asks: "Was the kind of private confession which Jewel is prepared to allow, confession preparatory to a priest's absolution considered as forgiving the sins confessed? Or was it the kind of thing which Calvin also had in mind?"<sup>1</sup>

Hughes seems to have missed Jewel's point entirely since it was this very idea that the Bishop attempted to convey; because sins were confessed directly to God they could be forgiven by His "priestly authority and power" on the testimony of the Word of God. Yet his question correctly implied that Jewel and Calvin were in fundamental agreement on the subject of confession. For Calvin, repentance and remission of sins were of the utmost importance because these two topics included a complete summary of the Gospel.<sup>2</sup> God offered

---

1. Philip Hughes, The Reformation in England, Vol. III, p. 93.

2. Calvin, Institutes, III:iii:19.

full and free forgiveness of sins upon sincere repentance which was not dependent on good works or upon the absolution of a priest, but was granted on the basis of the reconciling work of Christ.<sup>1</sup> Sins were to be confessed directly to God since He had been offended and since He alone could pardon and absolve. Absolution which was declared by the minister was conditional, for Calvin,

. . . allowing the sinner to trust that God is propitious to him, provided he sincerely seek expiation in the sacrifice of Christ, and accept the grace offered to him. Thus, he cannot err, who, in the capacity of a herald, promulgates what had been dictated to him from the word of God. The sinner again can receive a clear and sure absolution when, in regard to embracing the grace of Christ, the simple condition annexed is in terms of the general rule of our Master himself,--a rule impiously spurned by the Papacy,--"According to your faith be it unto you."<sup>2</sup>

According to both Jewel and Calvin, the Gospel which the minister proclaimed announced the forgiveness of sins and loosed the sinner. Therefore the concept of Penance as a Sacrament necessary for salvation, dependent on the formal and dogmatic declaration of the priest was false.

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, III:iv:25.

2. Ibid., III:iv:12, 14, 22.

The two Sacraments which the Church of England accepted were Baptism and the Lord's Supper because "in these two we have both the element and the institution."<sup>1</sup>

### III. THE TWO SACRAMENTS

#### A. THE ELEMENTS

Jewel's main efforts in his treatment of the Sacraments were expended toward a denial of the automatic and mechanical, if not magical, application of the Sacraments through divine power which the Church of Rome claimed to have been given by Christ through Peter and his successors, the apostles and those who followed in their priestly office. He was confronted with the Roman affirmation that the elements of the Sacraments "contain grace, and power to sanctify, after such manner of speaking as we say of potions and drinks prepared for sick persons, that they contain health, to the working whereof they be effectual."<sup>2</sup> The resulting question which Jewel initially had to answer

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1103.

2. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:443.



was whether Christ had given power to His Church to change the Sacramental elements of bread and wine into His very Body and Blood, and to so bless the water of Baptism that the Holy Spirit was given through it.

The Bishop categorically denied that such extraordinary power had been given, and believed in the context of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Service the elements were

. . . certain holy signs and ceremonies which Christ would we should use, that by them he might set before our eyes the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm the faith which we have in his blood, and might seal his grace in our hearts . . . and these sacraments . . . we do call figures, signs, marks, badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrance, and memories. And we make no doubt . . . to say that these be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, and tokens of grace.<sup>1</sup>

The elements before, during, and after consecration remained as they had always been: only signs, and

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:442; cf. Peter Martyr: "And the Holy Spirit used the sacraments to give us Christ spiritually, and to be embraced by the soul and faith; just as we are said to receive salvation by the words of God; not that salvation lies hidden in those words or stands in a real presence, but is contained by signification. And this comparison with divine words is very agreeable to the sacraments since by Augustine's judgment they are visible words." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 131.

never changed into the thing signified.<sup>1</sup> Since the Church had been granted no power by which to change the elements, wherein did the significance and power of the Sacraments lie?

The Reformer absolutely rejected the Roman Catholic concept that the Mass was an offering up of Christ to the Father through the power of consecration possessed by the priest or that Baptism made a Christian of the recipient. In place of this external sacrifice claimed by the Roman Church, and about which Jewel said to Harding: "Neither we no you can so offer him; nor did Christ ever give you commission to make such sacrifice,"<sup>2</sup> the Church of England offered a

. . . sacrifice of prayer, . . . alms-deeds,  
 . . . praise . . . thanksgiving . . . the death  
 of Christ . . . (and a presentation of) our  
 own bodies as a pure, and a holy, and a well-  
 pleasing sacrifice unto God, and to offer up  
 unto him the burning oblation of our lips.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:449; cf. A Treatise of the Sacraments, Works, II:1101; Defence, Works, III:445, 448.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:336.

3. Ibid.; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xvi-xvii; Peter Martyr: "The mystery itself of Christ's body and blood is called "eucharistia" because its whole construction depends upon the giving of thanks." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 232. Parenthesis mine.

"These," Jewel affirmed, were "the sacrifice of the Church of God."<sup>1</sup> The Church could not reoffer the sacrifice that Christ had once and for all time offered on the cross--she could only remember that offering and be thankful.<sup>2</sup> In like manner the Sacrament of Baptism did not transform the receiver into a Christian,<sup>3</sup> but was a remembrance of the washing away of the sins of the individual by the blood of Christ and a seal of His promises.<sup>4</sup>

The key to Jewel's understanding of the relation of the Sacraments to the Church, and their significance, is found in his doctrine of the Word of God. He asserted that the Church had not been given a power of changing the elements by consecration, but had been entrusted with the Word of God which alone could consecrate the external signs and constitute a Sacrament. Jewel described

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:336.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1107.

4. Ibid., II:1101; cf. G. W. Bromiley, Baptism and the Anglican Reformers (London: The Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 20.

the act of consecration as it was practiced in the English Church:

We pronounce the same words of consecration that Christ pronounced: we do the same that Christ bade us do: we proclaim the death of the Lord: we speak openly in a known tongue; and the people understandeth us: we consecrate for the congregation, and only for ourselves: we have the element: we join God's word unto it; and so it is made a sacrament.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel acknowledged his debt to Augustine for this concept of the consecration of the elements and frequently quoted his words: "Join the Word of God unto the element (or outward creature), and thereby is made a sacrament."<sup>2</sup> When speaking specifically of the Sacrament of Baptism he again cited Augustine to the same effect and further elaborated his position: "Why doth Christ not say, now ye are clean, because of the baptism wherewith ye are washed; saying that because in the water

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:123; cf. Peter Martyr: "For while this holy rite is being performed, there is brought to the signs through the institution and words of the Lord a sacramental reference." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 196.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:452, 462-463; A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1100; Augustinus, Joannis Evangelium, Tractat. LXXX, 3, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Pars II, Col. 703; cf. Martyr: "The sacraments also are believed, but they are nothing else than visible words of God, to which is also joined the Word of God--as Augustine said, 'The Word comes to the element and it is made a sacrament.'" McLelland, op. cit., p. 133.

it is the word that maketh clean? take away the word; and what is water more than water?"<sup>1</sup> The Bishop, adhering to this Augustinian concept, repudiated the view which had been held by Cyprian which formed the basis for the later development of the doctrine as explained by St. Thomas Aquinas, which in turn resulted in that which was defined by the Council of Trent.<sup>2</sup> Dugmore summarizes Cyprian's position as follows:

The belief that the Church alone has the Holy Spirit led him to claim that the Church alone administered valid sacraments . . . If the Church alone administers a valid Eucharist it is in virtue of the fact that the priest acting in Christ's stead imitated that which Christ did.<sup>3</sup>

After reviewing Augustine's doctrine, Dugmore concludes: "Augustine does not seem to have inherited Cyprian's theory of the consecration: he reproduces instead the older view of Justin and Irenaeus that the consecration of the elements is effected by the

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1105; Augustinus, Joannis Evangelium, Tractat. LXXX, 3, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Pars II, Col. 703.

2. Aquinas, The "Summa Theologica" of St Thomas Aquinas, Part III, Question 78, Article I, Objection I, in Vol. 17, p. 328; cf. Council of Trent, Session XIII, Canons I, III, in Canons and Decrees, pp. 82-83.

3. C. W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, p. 7.



operation of the Word."<sup>1</sup> As Augustine had reproduced an earlier view and made it his own, so Jewel repeated that of Augustine and cited it as the position of the Church of England. To possess the Word of God was to possess the means of consecrating the Sacraments.

The Word of God to which Jewel referred were the words Christ used to institute the Sacrament: "We pronounce the same words of consecration that Christ pronounced." It is to be noted that Jewel neither here, or in any of his writings, made any reference to a prayer of any sort being necessary for the consecration of the elements. E. C. Ratcliff suggests that it is possible that for the Bishop prayer was no part of consecration, for, he states: "It is not improbable that we have Jewel's definite statement that 'petition is no part of consecration'," if the letter which has traditionally been ascribed to Bishop Guest, Jewel's successor to the see of Salisbury, is really the work of the Apologist.<sup>2</sup> Even if these words are not Jewel's,

---

1. C. W. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, p. 7.

2. E. C. Ratcliff, "Usage of Eucharistic Consecration, 1548-1662--II," Theology, Vol. LX, no. 444 (June 1957), pp. 274-275. The text of this letter is in Gee, The Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments (New

it is certainly his thought that the words of Christ at the institution of the Sacrament alone are sufficient for consecration.<sup>1</sup>

In laying emphasis on the words of Christ, Jewel followed Western ecclesiastical tradition which differed from Eastern in that the Orthodox Churches had from early times declared that a prayer of invocation to the Holy Spirit was necessary for a proper consecration of the elements, while the Church in the West believed it was the words: "This is my body . . . this is my blood" which consecrated in the Eucharist, though prayer was a part of the Canon of the Roman Mass.<sup>2</sup> In affirming

---

York: Macmillan and Co., 1902), pp. 215-224; Ratcliff's quotation is on p. 221. Though Gee believes that this letter is the work of Guest, his arguments which are designed to show that the letter could not refer to the Prayer Book revision of 1559 could be equally applied to support the view that the letter is not Guest's at all. See Gee, Ibid., pp. 31-53.

1. Cf. Peter Martyr: "Three things are required in a sacrament: the promise, which is represented by words, the element by which the promise made is sealed, finally the command of God by which what is to be done is prescribed." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, pp. 133-134. Martyr too made no mention of prayer.

2. Cf. Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, pp. 268 ff. There is no clear Epiclesis in the Canon of the Roman Mass. A prayer of consecration was included by Cranmer in the Prayer Book of 1549, but this was deleted in the revision of 1552 and since that time has

that only the Word of God was necessary to consecration the Reformer was making no effort to demonstrate that the Church of England retained this traditional element in her liturgy, but sought rather to show that it was God's Word, and not the power of the Church working through the priest, which consecrated the elements and constituted a Sacrament. This Word was the supreme possession of Christ's Church.

Yet it must not be supposed that Jewel substituted the mechanical recitation of these words of institution in the place of the priest's use of the Canon of the Mass. This rather mechanical view is implied in Ratcliff's appraisal of Jewel's position: "In Jewel's judgment, therefore, the consecration or blessing of the elements, as he expounded it, was integral to the liturgical action of a rightly constituted communion service."<sup>1</sup> If this wooden approach to the consecration of the elements was true of the

---

never been a part of the Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer. The proposed Prayer Book of 1928 included a prayer of consecration in the Alternative Order for the Communion.

1. E. C. Ratcliff, "Usage of Eucharistic Consecration," pp. 275-276.

Bishop's view, it would, in effect, place him in virtually the same position as that which he criticized in the Church of Rome. Jewel's insistence on the use of the Word of God in the consecration leads to a more detailed consideration of his use of that Word in the whole context of the Sacraments.

When we look further into the Bishop's doctrine of the Eucharist we find once again evidence of his encounter with the great Reformers on the Continent; for when Jewel spoke of the Word of God he understood it to be more than the mere repetition of words, whether they were the Scriptural Words of Institution or not. In insisting that the words of consecration and of the whole Communion Service be pronounced in the vernacular and in an audible tone that the people might understand,<sup>1</sup> the Reformer showed that in his opinion recitation was not sufficient; comprehension was also necessary. Jewel's thought on this point closely paralleled Calvin's. The Genovan Reformer affirmed that the Word was necessary for the Sacrament, but that Word involved preaching: "You see," Calvin stated, "how the sacrament requires

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:697-698.

preaching to beget faith."<sup>1</sup> Jewel made exactly the same point when quoting Augustine's words: "The word of faith, which we preach . . . not the word which we whisper in secret, is the word of consecration."<sup>2</sup> In addition, when speaking specifically about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Bishop cited Chrysostom: "Where is the power of the gospel? In the forms of the letters, or else in the understanding of the meaning?"<sup>3</sup> To Jewel the answer to Chrysostom's rhetorical question was obvious. When Harding insisted that the formula used in Baptism in the early Church was "in the name of Christ" only, Jewel explained that this did not mean the literal repeating of these words, but meant "to baptize according to the order, institution, and commandment of Christ."<sup>4</sup> Jewel's meaning was plain--the power and significance of the Sacraments lay in their right understanding which came through the preaching of

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xiv:4.

2. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:123; Augustinus, Joannis Evangelium, Tractat. LXXX, 3, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Pars II, Col. 703.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:445; Chrysostomus, Op. Imperf. in Matt., Hom. XLIII, in Opera Omnia, Tom. VI, p. cixxiv.

4. Harding, Answer, Works, I:223; Jewel, Reply, Works, I:225.



the Word, not in the pronouncing of certain stated formulas.

Since the consecration and efficacy of the Sacraments were dependent on the presentation of the Word of God and its reception and resulting faith on the part of the believer, the ministry of the Word could never be separated from the proper administration of the Sacraments. For Jewel the ministry in the Church was one of preaching the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, yet these were not two distinct and divorced offices; they were in essence the same. The minister proclaimed the Gospel equally by expounding the Scripture and by administering Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In preaching the Word the minister proclaimed the message of Christ's death verbally; when delivering the Sacraments he employed "visible words."<sup>1</sup> The clergyman did fundamentally the same thing when he preached from the pulpit and when he administered the Sacraments at the font or altar. Preaching was not subordinate to the administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, nor vice versa--

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:442; see above, p. 326, note no. 2.

they were coordinate to each other.<sup>1</sup>

### B. THE RECIPIENT

Jewel's view of the indispensable Word leads directly to a consideration of his all-important concept of the relation between the Sacraments and the faith of the individual. Even though he declared that the elements in the Sacraments were "signs," "symbols," "pledges," "witnesses," "seals," and "confirmations," they were not "bare and naked signs."<sup>2</sup> The difference was determined by the individual's faith. It was by faith, the Bishop believed, after the consecration, i.e., the application of the Word, that the water of

---

1. There is a school of thought within Anglicanism which draws a definite distinction between the ministry of the Word and the ministry of the Sacraments. A. G. Herbert, in writing about non-episcopally ordained ministers, states that he would gladly accord such men the title of "Verbi Dei Minister," but to entrust the administration of the Sacraments into their hands would be wrong for such men are "different (and) . . . have always been different, (for) . . . the Free Church Ministries means something different from the Catholic Ministry." The Form of the Church (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1947), pp. 120-121. Cf. Martyr: "For they (Sacraments) have the same relation to it (justification) as the preaching of the Gospel and the promise about Christ offered to us, to salvation." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 131.

2. Cf. Council of Trent, Session XIII, "On the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist," Canons I, XI, in Canons and Decrees, pp. 82, 84.

Baptism signified and became, to the believer, the blood of Christ for the washing away of sins,<sup>1</sup> and the bread and wine in the same way signified and became to the man of faith, the body and blood of Christ.<sup>2</sup> The consecration with the Word did not change the creatures into that which they signified, but that which was thus signified could be recognized by faith.<sup>3</sup> If the Sacraments were to be effective, according to God's purpose, faith was a necessary prerequisite on the part of the recipient. The Sacraments did not initiate membership in the Body of Christ; they rather confirmed it as in the case of Baptism, and deepened it as in the case of the Lord's Supper. Jewel explained his belief:

This marvellous conjunction and incorporation is first begun and wrought by faith; as saith Paulinus unto St Augustine: "By faith we are incorporate or made one body with Jesus Christ our Lord." . . . And for that we are very unperfect of ourselves and therefore must daily proceed forward, that we

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1101. Jewel cited as foolish the adoration of the elements and calling them "Lord and God." Reply, Works, II:758-761.

2. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1117.

3. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:449.

may grow into a perfect man in Christ, therefore hath God appointed that the same incorporation should often be renewed and confirmed in us by the use of the holy mysteries. Wherein must be considered that the said mysteries do not begin, but rather confirm and continue, this incorporation. First of all we ourselves must be the body of Christ, and afterward we must receive the sacrament of Christ's body.<sup>1</sup>

This faith which had incorporated the individual into the Body of Christ, the Church, was the same faith which made possible a true appreciation of the Sacraments.<sup>2</sup>

We will now deal with each of the two Sacraments in its relation to the membership of the Church.

The Sacrament of Baptism, Jewel stated, was administered to those who responded with faith to the message of the Gospel. Peter had given the requirement for this rite in the words: "Amend your lives and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:140-141; Paulinus et Theras, ad August., Epist. XXX, 2, in Augustini Opera Omnia, Vol. II, Col. 121.

2. Cf. Peter Martyr: "Wherefore the wicked, who are destitute of that instrument by which the body and blood of the Lord are received, namely faith, do not for that reason receive the things themselves which are signified, but receive only the signs of those things. But those who are prepared with faith, just as with the mouth of the body they eat and drink the signs, so by the mouth of the mind they truly receive the body and blood of Christ." McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 162.

the remission of sins."<sup>1</sup> The formalities of Baptism and the use of the water were entirely secondary to the action of God in the heart of the individual in bringing about this change in life, and, Jewel declared, because of this, "salvation" and "baptism" were sometimes used synonymously by the Church:

Christ, saith the apostle, "loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it and cleanse it by the washing of water through the word," Again: "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of the new birth, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." For this cause is baptism called salvation, life, regeneration, the forgiveness of sins, the power of God to resurrection, the image and pledge of resurrection, and the seed of immortality. And yet are not these things wrought by the water; for then what need had we of Christ? what good did his passion? what doth the Holy Ghost work in our hearts? what power or force is left to the word of God?<sup>2</sup>

To make his position absolutely clear, lest anything magical be ascribed to the Baptismal ceremony itself, Jewel affirmed: "Salvation must be sought in Christ alone, and not in outward signs."<sup>3</sup> Citing the examples of Constantine the Great, the penitent thief on the cross,

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1105; Acts 2:38.

2. Jewel, loc. cit.; Ephesians 5:25-26; Titus 3:5.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:463.



"the prophet Jeremy and John Baptist (who) were sanctified in their mothers' wombs," he illustrated his belief that "the sacrament maketh not a Christian, but is a seal and assurance unto all that receive it of the grace of God, unless they make themselves unworthy thereof."<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the baptism of infants, Jewel was thoroughly Reformed in his opinions. He believed that as the children of Abraham had been heirs of God's promises to the Patriarch and had consequently received the rite of circumcision, so the children of believing parents, as heirs of God's new covenant made in Christ, were to receive the Sacrament of Baptism as a sign of that covenant.<sup>2</sup> "Our Children are the children of God," the Reformer affirmed, "He is our God, and the God of our seed. They be under the covenant with us."<sup>3</sup> Under the Old Covenant, infants born into the kingdom of Israel were a part of that kingdom by birth, and in the same way Jewel asserted that children of Christian parents were "a part of the church of God, . . . the

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1107.

2. Ibid., II:1104-1105.

3. Ibid., II:1107.

sheep of Christ, and (they) belong to his flock."<sup>1</sup>

Because of this there was no reason "why (they) should . . . not receive the seal whereby it is confirmed unto them."<sup>2</sup>

It is in the light of this position which Jewel set forth that such statements as: "For this cause are infants baptized because they are born in sin, and cannot become spiritual, but by this new birth of the water and the Spirit," or: "Baptism, therefore, is our regeneration or new birth, whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made sons of God and heirs of the kingdom of heaven," must be considered.<sup>3</sup> Though, as has been noted, Jewel believed that salvation was in no way dependent on Baptism, the rite was so identified in his mind with this work of the Spirit, that it was natural for him to mention both in the same context. Jewel's concern was always with the operation of the Spirit and

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1105; cf. Martyr: "Baptism is given us in place of circumcision, as Paul clearly writes to the Colossians. Now unless you wish our little ones to have fallen into a condition below the sons of Israel, just as they were circumcised in infancy, so you will acknowledge our children to be admitted to baptism . . . Do you doubt the infants of Christians to pertain to God as the sons of the Hebrews did?" McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 153.

2. Jewel, loc. cit. 3. Ibid., II:1104.

not with the rite itself which in no way controlled Him. In quoting Christ's words: "Except a man be born of the water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," the Reformer indicated the necessity for the new birth through the Spirit, adding: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," to prove that it was only by Him that new life in the spirit could be obtained, and not through any act of the "flesh."<sup>1</sup>

Jewel further clarified his position on Baptism by limiting the Sacrament only to the children of believing parents. Infants not born into Christian

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1104; John 3:6, 7; cf. Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, pp. 112-113. In rejecting Baptismal Regeneration, Jewel was not in accord with the teaching of his Church. Though Article XXVIII of the XXXIX Articles of Religion, in affirming that "they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church," leaves room for a broad interpretation, the Catechism and the Baptismal Service in the Prayer Book do not. It is difficult to reconcile the following from the Book of Common Prayer with Jewel's position: The Answer to the second Catechism Question: "My godfather and godmother in baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;" "I beseeche you to call upon God . . . that they may be Baptized with water and the holy ghost, and receyved into Christes holy church, and be made lyuely membres of the same;" "We call upon thee for these infantes, that they coming to thy holye Baptisme, may receyue remission of theyre synnes by spirituall regeneration." Cf. Doctrine in the Church of England, pp. 133, 138.

families were, he declared, "aliens from the common wealth of Israel, and . . . strangers from the covenant of promise" and could only be baptized when, upon coming of age, they "acknowledge the error in which they lived, and seek forgiveness of their former sins."<sup>1</sup> It was only after the unbelievers had been taught and brought to faith that their children, as members of the covenant, could be Baptized.<sup>2</sup> Yet Jewel never forgot that because of human sin, imperfection, and deficient faith ultimately the whole matter of Baptism rested with God alone. The Reformer conceded that it was true "that the sacrament dependeth not neither of the minister, nor of the receiver, nor of any other . . . for they all be the children of sin."<sup>3</sup> The value of the Sacrament depended on the One in Whom faith had been placed--Jesus Christ.

As the Sacrament of Baptism was efficacious only to those who were members of the Covenant, so the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was of avail only to those who were of Christ's mystical Body since individual faith was necessary for its proper reception. Jewel

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1105.

2. Jewel, Repl'r, Works, I:224.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:461.

stated:

It is our faith that applieth the death and cross of Christ to our benefit, and not the act of the massing priests. "Faith had in the sacraments," saith Augustine, "doth justify, and not the sacraments." And Origen saith: "Christ is the priest, the propitiation, and sacrifice; which propitiation cometh to every one by mean of faith." And so by this reckoning we say that the sacrament of Christ, without faith do not once profit those that be alive; a great deal less do they profit those that be dead.<sup>1</sup>

The members of the reformed Church of England held the evangelical faith that would let the elements become, for them, the body and the blood of Christ. This faith could be exercised effectively since the celebration of the Sacrament was plain and understood, not shrouded in the mystery of unseen actions and spoken in an unknown language. Jewel asserted: "The simplest of our people understandeth the nature and meaning of the holy mystery of our Lord's supper; and therefore they receive the same together to their great consolation."<sup>2</sup> Simplicity and order, according to Christ's own institution, were

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:556; Augustine, Joannis Evangelium, Tractat. LXXX, 3, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Pars II, Col. 703; Origenes, In Epistolam ad Romanos, Lib. III, 8, in Opera Omnia, Tom. VI, p. 213.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:444.



the standards adhered to by the Anglican Church so that nothing could come between the faithful and the reality of Christ in the Communion.<sup>1</sup>

Even though Jewel did not regard the Sacraments in the same way which they had traditionally been conceived, he nonetheless believed them to be of the greatest importance in the life of the individual believer and in the life of the Church. Baptism was to him "a great thing, because it is a sacrament of God"<sup>2</sup> and "a sacrament of the remission of sins, and of the washing which we have in the blood of Christ;" therefore "no person which will profess Christ's name ought to be restrained . . . therefrom."<sup>3</sup> For someone to claim to be a member of the Body of Christ, but to refuse the Sacrament of Baptism, was, to Jewel, a certain indication that the individual was not a child of God.<sup>4</sup> This Sacrament was the "ordinary way" of incorporation

---

1. For a more detailed account of Jewel's doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper see Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, pp. 203 ff., 226-233.

2. Jewel, Reply, Works, II:771; Augustinus, De Unico Baptismo Contra Petilianum, Caput V, 8, in Opera Omnia, Vol. IX Col. 599.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:460.

4. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1107.

into Christ's Body, and in Baptism the recipient received the "mark of God's folk."<sup>1</sup> The idea that the Sacraments were only "bare signs" was abhorrent to the Reformer and to such charges he answered: "They are not bare signs: it were blasphemy so to say."<sup>2</sup> He remarked that since they were God's Sacraments, His grace "doth always work with his sacraments; but," he hastened to add, "we are taught not to seek that grace in the sign, but to assure ourselves, by receiving the sign, that it is given by the thing signified."<sup>3</sup>

But in spite of his high estimate of the Sacraments, lest the Church of England fall into the same error as the Church of Rome, he reminded his fellow Anglicans that the Sacraments were not God and that He was "able to work salvation both with them and without them."<sup>4</sup> Old beliefs however died hard and he was

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1108; cf. Reply, Works, I:473.

2. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1101.

3. Ibid., II:1101-1102; cf. Martyr: "When Baptism or the Lord's Supper is administered, we should lead our mind away from water, from bread and wine, through faith unto Christ Himself, who is communicated to us," McLelland, The Visible Words of God, p. 136.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:463.

forced to admit that the question of an individual dying without having been Baptized or without having received the Lord's Supper was a "hard matter;" yet his evangelical faith did not falter, and because of his belief in the grace of God and the value of faith, he recognized that "grace is not tied so to the administration of the sacrament, that, if any be prevented by death, so that he cannot receive the fellowship thereof, he should therefore be thought to be damned."<sup>1</sup> In support of this belief he cited many who had "suffered death for God's cause, for their faith in Christ, who were never baptized; yet," he recalled, they "are . . . reckoned . . . blessed martyrs."<sup>2</sup> He called attention to the "infinite numbers of children and others (who) depart this life in God's mercy, without that victual (the Lord's Supper)."<sup>3</sup> He concluded that, important as the Sacraments were in the Church, they could not be considered necessary for salvation.

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1107.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:136; cf. I:450. Parentheses mine.

Jewel did not mention the question of lay Baptism in his discussion of the Sacrament, but throughout his consideration he implied that there was no necessity for it. He spoke slightly of the Roman Catholic practice of permitting laymen and women to Baptize. Since he did not regard Baptism as being necessary for salvation there was no reason for such provision in his doctrine.<sup>1</sup> Although it was generally agreed among the Anglican Reformers that lay Baptism ought not to be allowed,<sup>2</sup> and especially by women,<sup>3</sup> this was not the official position of the Church of England as expressed in her liturgy. The Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552, being somewhat conservative in many matters, especially as regarded Baptism, provided a service "Of Them That Be Baptyseed in Priuate Houses In Tyme of Necessitie," in which definite provision was made for Baptism by laymen, without regard to the sex of the one administering the Sacrament. Lay Baptism was recognized as

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:444.

2. Cf. Bromiley, Baptism and the Anglican Reformers, pp. 80-85.

3. In a letter to Bullinger and Gaultor of February 6th, 1567, Grindal and Horne stated: "We entirely agree that women neither can nor ought to Baptize infants, upon any account whatever." Zurich Letters, Vol. I, p. 178.

legal in the Church of England in Elizabethan times, for when on January 19th, 1563, at a meeting of Convocation, Bishop Sandys of Worcester proposed a measure forbidding lay Baptism and the use of the sign of the cross in the Sacrament by Act of Parliament, the proposed change in the practice of the Church was defeated through the efforts of the Queen.<sup>1</sup> Jewel, either fearing the possibility of embarrassment by trying to justify this Roman attitude of the English Church, or because he felt the matter to be of no consequence, sought no answer to the problem.

#### C. THE MINISTER

Thus far little has been said about the minister's place in the administration of the Sacraments, mainly because Jewel himself said little in reference to this matter. He never thought of a "valid" or "invalid" Sacrament in terms of the ecclesiastical orders of the officiating clergyman, but thought only in terms of the relation of the Word of God and the faith of the individual to the elements. Jewel, in acknowledging

---

1. See William Clark, The Anglican Reformation, p. 287.



a true Church to be that body wherein the Word of God was preached and the Sacraments rightly administered, and in accepting other Churches of the Reformation, though not possessing the episcopacy or succession as held by the Church of England, to be true Churches of God, recognized that the orders of the minister had nothing to do with the Sacrament's validity or efficacy. He believed that the minister, being a man, gave only the elements, while God gave that which was signified.<sup>1</sup>

Regarding the question of the moral character of the minister in relation to the efficacy of the Sacrament, Jewel was a traditionalist:

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:462-463. In affirming this belief, Jewel expressed his Suvermerian tendency which predominates his thought about the Sacraments. See Frederick J. Smithen, Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation (London: James Clarke and Co. Ltd., 1927), pp. 201-204, 211. Dugmore holds that Jewel was not as much influenced by the Continental Reformers as many have supposed, and in reality occupied a position close to that of Augustine and Cranmer which he describes as "realist-symbolist." The Mass and the English Reformers, pp. 208-209, 226-233, 236. In truth, with the exception of the Lutheran doctrine of Ubiquity which he absolutely rejected (See Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 100, 123, 127, 139; Works, IV:1245, 1264), some trace of practically every Reformed Sacramental doctrine can be found in his writings. See Reply, Works, I:449; A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1109-1124.

Now, touching the minister of this sacrament, whether he be a good man or an evil man, godly or godless, an heretic or a catholic, an idolater or a true worshipper of God; the effect is all one, the value or worthwhileness of the sacrament dependeth not of man, but of God. Man pronounceth the word; but God setteth our heart with grace. . . . It is not the minister, but Christ himself, which is the "Lamb of God."<sup>1</sup>

It is to be noted that even though Jewel followed the teaching of the Roman Church regarding the validity of a Sacrament irrespective of the celebrant's moral character, it was for a significantly different reason. Whereas the Church of Rome affirmed that if "a minister, being in mortal sin . . . observe all the essentials which belong to the effecting, or conferring of, the sacrament,"<sup>2</sup> which included right ordination according to Roman definition,<sup>3</sup> it was truly conferred; Jewel believed that God worked through, and in independence of, these channels thought by the Roman Church to be necessary. He held that the preaching of the Gospel

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1106; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:1:19.

2. Council of Trent, Session VII, "On the Sacraments in General," Canon XII, in Canons and Decrees, p. 55.

3. See Marianus Johannes Vetter, "Ministerius et Sacramenta According to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church," in The Ministry and the Sacraments, R. Dunkerly editor (London: S.C.M. Press, 1937), pp. 61 ff.

and the administration of the Sacraments belonged to the clergy, but he attached no theological significance to this delegation of responsibility other than God's having called the individual to that particular ministry. When speaking of Jewel and the other sixteenth century English Reformers regarding their attitude toward the validity of orders and the Sacraments, Keble correctly interpreted their views in remarking: "They never . . . connect the succession with the validity of the holy Sacraments."<sup>1</sup>

The Apologist, together with his Roman Catholic opponents, believed that only the genuine Church of God could administer the Sacraments rightly, but they differed radically on their definition of that Church. The Church of Rome claimed that a valid Sacrament depended on rites and ceremonies carried out according to the instructions dictated by that infallible Church to which Christ had given divine power transmitted by proper ordination. Jewel believed that a valid Sacrament depended on the Word of God operating in the hearts of those who, by faith, constituted the Body

---

1. John Keble, editor, *Works of Hooker*, Vol. I, p. lix.

of Christ, enabling them to recognize by that same faith that which the elements of the Sacraments signified. In this sense both Roman and Anglican agreed that only within the true Church could the Sacraments be administered effectively.

In Jewel's thought this faith which was necessary for right reception was fostered by the Word of God which consecrated the elements and made such reception possible. The Sacraments depended on the ministry of the Church in as far as ministers were necessary for the preaching of the Word, which in turn was responsible for the faith which incorporated the individual into the Church. The ministry, having been entrusted with the preaching of the Word, had also, as a part of that commission, and not separate from it, been appointed to administer the Sacraments. This had been done, not because of any inherent powers present in the ministry through ordination, but because of God's call to proclaim the Word. Jewel attached no more theological importance to the administration of the Sacraments by the ordained clergy than he attached to the delegation of the preaching of the Gospel to this office.

## IV. SUMMARY

As in all matters concerning the Christian faith, Jewel's first recourse when discussing the Sacraments of the Church was to the Holy Scriptures. In them he found warrant for only two of the seven traditional Sacraments of the Roman Church--Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The remaining "five commonly called Sacraments" had been retained by the Church of England because of their long history in the Church and their general usefulness to the Church of England, but with many modifications in both interpretation and ceremony, and a denial of their Sacramental nature.

Jewel's doctrine of the Sacraments was intricately bound up with his belief in the nature of the Church as primarily the community of God's faithful people called together by, and living under, the Word of God. It was only in a Church so constituted on the Scriptures that the Sacraments could be administered validly since this Church possessed that Word which consecrated the elements with Christ's words of institution and fostered the requisite faith in the recipients. This spiritual awareness in the receiver, made possible by a faith dependent on the Gospel, replaced the magical and



mechanical application of the Sacraments by the Roman Church. The Church herself had no power to cause the Sacramental elements to become objectively that which they signified; she could only through her ministers preach the Gospel which engendered faith by which that which the elements signified could be received.

In the Church of Rome the officiating priest played an essential part in the administration of the Sacraments, for without him there could be no consecration, and consequently no valid Sacrament. Jewel's concept of the role of the minister in the administration of the Sacraments was high indeed, but for a reason different than that of the Roman Church. Since the effectiveness of the Sacraments depended on the faith of the individual receiving them, it was the minister's responsibility to so expound the Word of God that faith was fostered and enlarged in the people. In the conduct of the Sacraments the minister was doing fundamentally the same thing as he did when preaching the Gospel. There was no differentiation between the "Word" and "Sacrament;" they were all one and equal.

Though it has not been the purpose of this chapter to consider Jewel's doctrine of the Sacraments

as such, it is obvious that his view, especially of the Lord's Supper, leaves much to be desired. It must be remembered that his chief purpose was to prove that the Roman doctrines of Transubstantiation and Baptismal Regeneration were unscriptural and unsupported by the early Church; it was not to construct a positive and consistent theology of the Sacraments. The Reformer could not be accused of following the interpretations of Calvin, Luther, or Zwingli, yet elements of each can be found in Jewel's writings. The Bishop's doctrine reflected his intense anti-Roman bias rather than any one school of thought, though by his own admission the doctrine of the Sacraments as held by the Church of England was nearly identical to that expressed in the Confession of Zurich.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE MARKS OF THE CHURCH

If the Reformers of the sixteenth century, both in Britain and on the Continent, were not wholly in agreement on some minor issues, e.g., ecclesiastical polity or the exact interpretation of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, they were united on the marks or notes by which the true Church of Christ was known. These marks were two and sometimes three in number: the preaching of the Word or right doctrine, the right administration of the Sacraments, and often was added the proper use of ecclesiastical discipline.<sup>1</sup> Because

---

1. E.g., Article XIX of the XXXIX Articles of Religion: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same;" Article VII of the Augsburg Confession: "(The Church is) a congregation of the saints in which the gospel is purely taught and the sacraments rightly administered;" Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:9: "Wherever we find the word of God purely preached and heard, and the sacraments administered according to the institution of Christ, there, it is not to be doubted, is a Church of God.;" Bullinger, Decades, Vol. V, Sermon I: "And there are

there is no reason to doubt the tradition that Jewel was the author<sup>1</sup> of the Homily for Whitsunday in which it is stated: "The true Church hath always three notes or marks, whereby it is known: pure and sound doctrine, the Sacraments ministered according to Christ's holy institution, and the right use of ecclesiastical discipline,"<sup>2</sup> we have his definite statement affirming

---

two special and principal marks, the sincere preaching of the word of God, and the lawful partaking of the sacraments of Christ; where as some add unto these the study of godliness and unity, patience in affliction, and the calling on the name of God by Christ; but we include them in these twain that we have set down;" Article XVIII of the Scots Confession of 1560: "The notes therefore of the trew Kirk of God, we beleve, confesse, and avow to be, first, the trew preaching of the worde of God, . . . Secoundly, the right administration of the Sacraments of Christ Jesus, . . . Last, ecclesiastical discipline uprightlie ministered, as Goddis worde prescribes;" Article XXIX of the Belgic Confession of 1561: "The marks by which the true Church is known are these: If the pure doctrine of the gospel is preached therein; if she maintains the pure administration of the sacraments as instituted by Christ; if Christian discipline is exercised in punishing of sin."

1. See Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, s.v. "Homilies, Books of," p. 651.

2. Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory (United Kingdom: Nuttall, Fisher, and Dixon, 1811), p. 298.

his agreement with his contemporary Reformers regarding the notes of the true Church. Jewel's views on the relation of the Church to the ministry, the Scriptures, ecclesiastical discipline, and the Sacraments have been treated in previous chapters; therefore this present chapter is devoted to a consideration of Jewel's application of the four traditional marks of the Church, i.e., Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, to the Church of England.

The first listing of these notes of the Church was in the Nicene Creed wherein it is affirmed: "And I believe one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church."<sup>1</sup> As the author of the article on "The Notes of the Church" in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church reminds us,<sup>2</sup> while these marks of the Church had long been accepted by the Church, it was not until after the Reformation that, through controversy, they became well defined from both the Protestant and Roman Catholic points of view. The lack of any authoritative definition of these notes of the Church was reflected in the way

---

1. See Harold Smith, The Creeds, their History, Nature and Use (London: Robert Scott, 1912), pp. 132 ff.

2. Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 966.



in which they were discussed by Jewel and Harding. Neither man approached these traditional marks in a logical or systematic manner, and when the notes were mentioned at all, they were incidental to a more important issue under consideration. However, the way in which these marks were applied and interpreted by the disputants, a pattern can be seen to form which foreshadowed the more exact definitions of these notes in succeeding centuries.<sup>1</sup>

## I. UNITY

The unity of the Church of Christ had been affirmed since the time of the New Testament. But with the increased institutionalization and centralization of the Church around the Roman pontiff, the definition of that unity had so evolved that by the time of the Reformation it had lost much of its original spiritual nature and was presented by the Church of Rome in dogmatic and inflexible terms, the best example of which was the "Una Sanctam" of Boniface VIII, issued in

---

1. See Gustave Thijs, Les Notes De L'Eglise Dans L'Apologetique Catholique (Depuis La Reforme: J. Duculot Gemblus, 1936). This work contains an especially valuable bibliography on the marks of the Church, pp. xxviii-lviii.

November, 1302:

We do firmly believe and simply confess--that there is one holy Catholic and apostolic Church, outside of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins . . . of which body the head is Christ . . . In this church there is one Lord, one faith and one baptism . . . of this one and only church there is one body and one head . . . Christ, namely, and the vicar of Christ, St Peter, and the successor of Peter . . . We declare, announce and define, that it is altogether necessary to salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.<sup>1</sup>

Harding reiterated this position and after stating, as Boniface had done, that Christ was the Head of the Church, he immediately qualified his statement with the addition: "Yet need it is, forasmuch as Christ now dwelleth not with us in a visible presence, his church have one man to do his stead of outward ruling in earth."<sup>2</sup> The one true Church was that Church "which from St Peter's time to this day flourisheth in her head the bishop of Rome, and in her members throughout the world, which abide in the unity of the same bishop."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Text in Anne Freemantle, editor, The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context (New York: Mentor Books, 1956), pp. 72-74. Cf. the "Quanto Conficiamur" of Pius IX, August 10th, 1863, and his encyclical condemning the Society for Christian Unity, September 16th, 1864 in ibid., pp. 130-132.

2. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:274.

3. Ibid.

For the Roman Catholics the essential unity of the Church was in allegiance to one man and to that ecclesiastical body of which he was the head on earth. A unity of faith and doctrine was dependent upon this primary unity.

The fact of separation from the ancient Church of Rome was a real one to the leaders of the Reformation, and presented them with an acute problem. Whether, as in the case of the Continental Reformation, the separation from the Roman Church had come as a result of a desire for theological reform and ended in a severance from Rome, or as in England where the break occurred first, followed by a reformation in doctrine, the end result was the same: the unity of Western Christendom had been destroyed, and even in those early days fragmentation had already begun and was proceeding at an alarming rate. It is difficult for those living many centuries after the Reformation, having become accustomed to, tolerant and defensive of the divisions within Christendom, to appreciate fully what it meant to the medieval mind, so imbued with the concept of political and ecclesiastical unity, to suddenly find itself called upon to support schism from an institution whose unity had been made venerable by centuries. Jewel

was mindful of this serious step which had been taken, and sought to justify it by defining what the Church of England meant by the unity of the Church.

Despite the Protestant separation from the Church of Rome and the divisions which existed even among the Protestants themselves, the Reformer affirmed with all honesty, speaking for his Church: "We believe that there is one Church of God."<sup>1</sup> How was it possible for him to profess this belief, when it was obvious to all that the Church had been rended apart so that there were not only the Churches of the East and of Rome, but also of England, Scotland, Geneva, Wittenberg, Zurich, Sweden, etc.?

Jewel's belief in the unity of the Church was a logical consequence of his belief in the Church as the Body of Christ. He declared: "The Church of God is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ: it is the company of the faithful, whom God hath gathered together

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:59; cf. The Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man (1543), in Doctrine of the Church of England as stated in Ecclesiastical Documents set forth by Authority of Church and State in the Reformation Period Between 1536 and 1662 (London: Rivingtons, 1868), p. 71; E. G. Rupp, Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition (Cambridge: The University Press, 1947), pp. xiv-xv.

in Christ by his word and by the Holy Ghost."<sup>1</sup> While the Church was comprized of individuals, it was fundamentally a spiritual unity; as there was only one Christ, there could be only one Body of Christ, the Church, an invisible and spiritual entity of people bound to their Lord, and to each other, thus forming this mystical unity. "This," asserted the Bishop, "is the unity of the church, that the whole flock may hear the voice of that one Shepherd, and follow him. And that one Shepherd is Christ the Son of God."<sup>2</sup> It was, Jewel believed, never allegiance to a visible institution under the headship of a mortal man that made the members of that institution partakers in Christ and a part of His Body; it was heeding His call to discipleship which engrafted the individual into that spiritual Church.<sup>3</sup>

This unity which Jewel professed was therefore essentially one of faith, doctrine, and a common allegiance to Christ. He indicated that even if all the

---

1. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:819.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:751; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:vi:1, 10.

3. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:234.



external forces which seemed necessary, to human eyes, for the unity of the Church, i.e.,

. . . godly princes, the soldiers, the ecclesiastical prelates and subjects . . . be overthrown; yet evermore some remain in which the truth of faith and the righteousness of a good conscience is preserved. And, although there remained but two faithful men in the world, yet in the same two the Church of God should be saved; which church is the unity of the faithful.<sup>1</sup>

This mark of faith had characterized the Church from the very beginning of God's people. It was faith which had been necessary to make the children of Israel into the people of God; in like manner it was faith which brought individuals into the unity of the Church, and it was faith which maintained that unity.<sup>2</sup>

The Bishop recognized that the Roman Church possessed a certain unity which, superficially, would indicate that she was the one true Church of Christ. He realized that her claims were great, and not without the support of over a thousand years of history, but, he contended, these were nothing if the true faith of Christ had been discarded:

Though they pretend shew of holiness, though they draw to themselves credit by long contin-

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:724; Fortalitium Fidei, Liber Quintus, "De bello demonum," Nona consideratio, fo. cccxi (Lugduni:1511).

2. Jewel, op. cit., III:280.

uance, though their numbers be great, and they consent together; yet, if they have forsaken the faith, if they hold not the truth of Christ, . . . if their circumcision be not the circumcision of the heart . . . they have only a painted visard, and carry only an empty name of the church: they call themselves so, and are not.<sup>1</sup>

The outward appearance of a Church about which Rome was so particular, e.g., orders, rites, ceremonies, was not sufficient to maintain genuine unity, for, Jewel continued: "The wasps also make honeycombs as well as bees, although there be no honey in them."<sup>2</sup> This kind of unity fell far short of the authentic unity which was a mark of Christ's Church. A common allegiance to the bishop of Rome was no substitute for devotion to Christ; faith in the Church could never take the place of faith in the Word of God; and unity itself was of no avail. While Jewel agreed that "truth, unity and concord doth best become religion," he admitted, because of that which had been experienced in the Church of Rome, "yet is it not the sure and certain mark whereby to know the church of God,"<sup>3</sup> He observed:

---

1. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:819.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:713.

3. Ibid., III:620.

"There was the greatest unity that might be amongst them that worship the golden calf, and among them which with one voice jointly cried against our Saviour Jesus Christ, 'Crucify him'."<sup>1</sup> Conversely, he added,

. . . neither because the Corinthians were unquieted with private discussions, or because the christians upon the very beginning of the gospel were at mutual discord touching some one matter or other, may we therefore think there was no Church of God amongst them.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel was characteristically English in his attitude toward the separation of the Church of England from the see of Rome. He was fully aware of the charge of schism which had been directed at the Anglican Church and felt it necessary to explain, on the basis of what he believed true unity to be, the reasoning behind the Church's actions. It was, he admitted, "doubtless an odious matter for one to leave the fellowship whereunto he hath been accustomed," but, though the separation had been "much against our wills," the break from the Roman Church "was of very necessity."<sup>3</sup> The English prelates had done nothing imprudent; the de-

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:713.

2. Ibid., III:620.

3. Ibid., IV:709.

cision, he reminded his opponent, was arrived at without "either rashness or arrogancy; nor nothing, but with good leisure and great consideration."<sup>1</sup>

The reasons for leaving the fellowship of the Church of Rome were compelling and overwhelming. The pope had deprived the people of their Scriptures, the Gospel, and thus their salvation.<sup>2</sup> Jewel, in almost the same words used by Calvin, stated the main justification for the Anglican schism: "Unless we left him (the pope), we could not come to Christ."<sup>3</sup> The matter had been too important to await the long and uncertain deliberations of a general council, therefore, the Apologist declared,

. . . forasmuch as we were most acertain'd of God's will, and therefore counted it a wickedness to be too careful and overcumbered about the judgments of mortal men; we could no longer stand taking advice with flesh and blood, but rather thought good to do the same thing that both might rightly be done, and hath many a time been done, as well of other men as also of many catholic bishops; that is, to remedy our own churches by a provincial synod.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:1039.

2. Ibid., IV:1066.

3. Ibid.; see Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:6; parenthesis mine.

4. Jewel, op. cit., IV:1048-1049.

The Church of England, as a national entity, was free to reform herself and to cleanse herself of the error which had arisen through her subjection to the Roman pontiff. This she had done calmly, legally, deliberately, and in good order; yet in so doing she had not shown contempt for the universal Church, but had demonstrated unusual consideration for the welfare of the Church as a whole. Jewel observed:

He hindereth not health, that sheweth the disease. He despiseth not the church, that setteth Christ before the church. The church is our mother; but Christ saith: "Whoso loveth his father or mother more than me is not meet to be my disciple." He despiseth not his mother, that lamenteth the captivity of his mother, and delivereth her from the hand of thieves.<sup>1</sup>

For the sake of truth and the spiritual unity of the Church, the Church of England had no other choice but to separate herself from that body which was filled with error.

It was the Anglican contention that rather than having left the Church of God, the English had returned to her. It was the Church of Rome which had left the faith,, and as a result she had separated her-

---

1. Jewel, Answer, Works, I:98; Matthew 10:37.



self from the true Church of Christ. Jewel held that Rome had "gone from the old holy fathers, and from the apostles, and from Christ himself, and from the primitive and catholic church of God."<sup>1</sup> The Church of Rome was in the same relation to the early Church as was the moon in wane to the full moon, and as was Jerusalem under Manasses to the Jerusalem ruled by David.<sup>2</sup> As Moses had left Egypt, St. Augustine had left the Manichees,<sup>3</sup> Daniel had gone out of the lion's den, and the three Hebrew children had left the furnace,<sup>4</sup> the Church of England had left the Church of Rome.<sup>5</sup> Jewel had no compunctions about identifying the reformed Church of England with the ancient Church of the fathers, and he boldly applied the eloquent words of Chrysostom to the situation then obtaining in England:

Touching this new Jerusalem, which is the church, that they were spiritual christian men, leaving

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:1039-1040.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:877.

3. Ibid., IV:876.

4. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:889.

5. Cf. Calvin, Reply to Sadoleto, in Calvin: Theological Treatises, translated by J. K. S. Reid (Vol. XXII of The Library of Christian Classics, Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954), p. 249.

the bodily church, which the wicked by violence had invaded, departed out from them; or, as St John expounded it, they departed out from us. . . . We have departed from them in body, they have departed from us in mind: we from them by place; they from us by faith. We have left with the foundations of the walls, they have left with us the foundations of the scriptures. We are departed forth from them in the sight of man: they are departed from us in the judgment of God.<sup>1</sup>

Belief in the doctrine of the unity of the Church was a precious possession of the Anglican Church, and a doctrine which she expressed as an outward mark, but it was a spiritual unity through faith in Christ which was shared with the Church catholic throughout the ages; it was not unity with an institutional Church, no matter how old or large.

## II. HOLINESS

Comments regarding the holiness of the Church, one of the four traditional marks of the Church, which was usually treated by the Reformers, are notably absent from Jewel's works.<sup>2</sup> Though there were many opportunities for considering this note of the Church, e.g.,

1. Jewel, *Defence, Works*, IV:877; Chrysostomus, *Matthaeum Hom.* XLVI, Caput XXIV, in *Opera Omnia*, Tom. VI, p. cxcv.

2. See Calvin, *Institutes*, IV:i:17-22; Bullinger, *Decades*, Volume I, Sermon IX, p. 162; Volume IV, Sermon I, p. 36, Sermon II, p. 49.

when speaking of the Church as Christ's Body, as centering in God, and as the society of God's redeemed people, it nonetheless was one of the few doctrines which did not enter into the discussions carried on between Harding and the Reformer. Jewel was never reluctant to speak of the holiness of the ministry,<sup>1</sup> of the fathers of the Church,<sup>2</sup> of the Sacraments,<sup>3</sup> or of the Scriptures, yet his only reference to the holiness of the Church is in quotations from the Scriptures or from the fathers. In his sermon on I Thessalonians, Jewel described the Church, using Paul's words in Ephesians II, as "holy," and a "holy temple," but he did not elaborate this marks of the Church, mentioning it only because the Church was thus spoken of by the Apostle.<sup>4</sup> Augustine's famous words concerning

---

1. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1129 ff; see above, pp. 140-142.

2. Jewel, Refence, Works, III:225.

3. Jewel, A Treatise on the Sacraments, Works, II:1099 et passim; Apology, Works, III:442.

4. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:819; Ephesians 2:21. In the paragraph previous to the one in which he quoted the words of Paul, Jewel, referring to the Roman Church, stated: "Though they pretend shew of holiness, . . . they . . . carry only an empty name of the church: they call themselves so, and are not." It would have been natural for him to relate this . . .

the difference between believing that there was a holy Church, yet not believing in that Church, were also quoted by the Bishop, but without reference to her holiness.<sup>1</sup>

### III. CATHOLICITY

The word "catholic" (Καθολικός) had been used first by Ignatius of Antioch (c. 35-c. 107) in his letter to Smyrna to describe the Christian Church. In this letter it referred to no one particular Church, but to all Churches holding the one faith of Christ, for, he said: "Where Christ is there is the Catholic Church."<sup>2</sup> In subsequent years, with the evolving supremacy of the Church of Rome over other Churches, the word came increasingly to be applied to the Church of Rome until, by the time of the middle ages, "catholic"

---

statement to Paul's description of the Church as "holy" and to enter upon a discussion of Rome's corruptions (an opportunity which he always welcomed), but he did not. Neither when considering the various sects did Jewel make any mention of their extraordinary claims to holiness.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:434; Augustinus, De Fide et Symbolo, Caput X, 21, in Opera Omnia, Vol. VI, Col. 193.

2. Ignatius, "Epistola ad Smyrnaeos," in SS. Patrum Qui Temporibus Apostolicis Floruerunt (Amstelædami: R. and G. Wetstenios, 1724), Vol. II, p. 36.

was identified solely with the Church in the West under the rule of the Roman pontiff.<sup>1</sup> Though the Roman Church never defined officially the meaning of the word, implicit in her use of it was the presupposition that the Church of Rome was destined to include all men throughout the world, and consequently she had the right to be free from all forces which would curtail her actions or limit her powers. This naturally excluded all particularism and nationalism in her definition.<sup>2</sup>

It was this concept of catholicity on which Harding based his arguments, and against which Jewel defended the position of the Church of England. Harding stated: "For as touching that church, whereof all Christian people hath ever taken the successor of Peter to be the head under Christ (it) . . . is the true catholic Church,"<sup>3</sup> The only Church, the Romans claimed, that could rightly bear the title "catholic"

---

1. From 1054 the Eastern Church preferred to be known as "orthodox," but did not deny that she was also "catholic."

2. Cf. Dictionnaire De Théologie Catholique, s.v. "Catholicité," by H. Moureau, Vol. II, part 2, pp. 2002-2008.

3. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:265.



was that Church in which there was a threefold universality: "of places, . . . of times, and of men."<sup>1</sup> "If," Harding declared, "these defenders prove not the church they profess themselves to be of to have this threefold universality, then is their congregation not this one church, nor of this one church of God, but the synagogue of antichrist."<sup>2</sup> According to Jewel's opponent this was the meaning of the well-known phrase of St. Vincent Lerins (c. 450): "Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est,"<sup>3</sup> which the Roman Church held to be applicable only to herself.

Jewel refused to accept this threefold universality of place, times, and men as given by St. Vincent and repeated by Harding, without exception, as long as they were interpreted in strict Roman Catholic categories. "These general notes," affirmed the Bishop, "must be limited with this special restraint: 'Where as the churches were not corrupted'."<sup>4</sup> If this univer-

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:266.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.; Vincentius Lirinensis, Commonitorium, in Sanctorum Presbyterorum Salviani Massiliensis et Vincentii Lirinensis Opera (Paris: Stephanus Balvzius, 1669), editio secunda, p. 317.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:267; Lirinensis, loc. cit.

salinity was to be the true test of catholicity, the Reformer continued, "there was never any doctrine so catholic, no not the confessed doctrine of Christ himself, that hath been received 'evermore' and 'every where,' and 'of all men,' without any exception."<sup>1</sup>

The faith held by the Roman Church could not be described in such sweeping terms, for, Jewel reminded Harding, "ye cannot by your own definition call it catholic,"<sup>2</sup> On the contrary, the Apologist declared: "The catholic church of God standeth not in multitude of persons, but in weight of truth. Otherwise Christ himself and his apostles had not been catholic; for his flock was very little; and the catholic or universal consent of the world stood against it."<sup>3</sup> The number of people holding a doctrine did not make a belief catholic, and the number of people holding that doctrine did not make it true. It was the truth of God alone, which held by a Church, made her catholic, no matter how few held it.<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:267-268.

2. Ibid., III:268

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., IV:1053-1054; cf. Calvin, Institutes, IV:1:2. A contemporary expression of this position is in The Catholicity of Protestantism, R. N. Flew and R. E.

In addition, it was the Roman contention that since the faith, as they held it, was far older than that of the Reformation Churches, she therefore possessed the genuine faith of the Church catholic because it, and she, had stood the test of time. Jewel too regarded catholicity in terms of time, but it was not the length of time with which he and his Church were concerned--it was adherence to the faith of the Church as it was held during the first five centuries of the Christian era. "We say," the Bishop explained, "that our doctrine and the order of our Churches is elder than yours by five-hundred whole years and more."<sup>1</sup> Jewel thereby expressed his conviction that the doctrines and practices of the Roman Church had their origins in the sixth century, while the Church of England had gone back beyond that period when corruption had begun to creep into the Church, to the earliest times, and had planted her roots in the soil of the ancient and pure Church of Christ and the apostles.

---

Davis, editors (London: Lutterworth Press, 1953), p. 21: "(Catholicity) is the presence of the living Christ, recognized, adored and obeyed, which secures the catholicity of the Church. Nothing else is necessary; and if a Christian . . . lives on an island which is otherwise inhabited by devil-worshipping savages, the catholic Church is present in his person."

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:267.

In response to Harding's charge: "They have forsaken the catholic church: they went from us who were not of us," Jewel asserted: "We are returned to the catholic church of Christ, and have forsaken you, because you have manifestly forsaken the ways of God."<sup>1</sup>

The Anglican Church laid claim to being fully "catholic" because her practices and doctrines agreed "with the doings of the ancient fathers, and have the warrant of the councils of the primitive Church."<sup>2</sup>

But the ultimate test of catholicity was neither councils nor fathers--it was the Word of God, and the Anglican Church, by this criterion alone, was catholic.<sup>3</sup>

In insisting that the claim of the Church of England was truly catholic because she was obedient to Christ and His Word, Jewel also recognized that other Churches, though different from the Anglican Church in many ways, were catholic for the same reason. As it was not necessary for any particular Church to be under the bishop of Rome in order to be in the unity of the Church of Christ, so it was unnecessary for a

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:175.

2. Ibid., IV:1054.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:57.

Church to be under the subjection of the Roman see to bear the name catholic. This position had been expounded earlier in the course of the English Reformation under King Henry VIII in considerable detail:

And therefore the Church of Rome, being but a several Church, challenging that name of "Catholic" above all other, doeth great wrong to all other Churches . . . for that Church hath no more right to that name than the Church of France, Spain, England, or Portugal, which be justly called Catholic Churches, in that they do profess, consent, and agree in one unity of true faith with other Catholic Churches. . . . It is to be noted, that this Church of England, and other known particular Churches, in which Christ's name is truly honoured, called on, and professed in faith and baptism, be members of the whole Catholic Church, and each of them by itself is also worthily called a Catholic Church, when there merely profess and teach the faith and religion of Christ, according to the Scriptures and the Apostolic doctrine.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel, in stating his position regarding catholicity, mirrored the attitude of the Church of England since her break from the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>2</sup>

#### IV. APOSTOLICITY

The fourth traditional mark of the Church was

---

1. Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christian Man ("The King's Book" of 1543), in Doctrine of the Church of England, pp. 73-74.

2. Cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, The Riddle of Roman Catholicism (New York: Abingdon Press, 1959), Chapter



that of apostolicity. This note was considered to be the most important of the four, since the unity, holiness, and catholicity of the Church ultimately depended upon her apostolicity as it was conceived by the Church of Rome. Thomas O'Reilly, writing on "Apostolicity" in the Catholic Encyclopedia, states that this note is "the surest indication of the true Church of Christ."<sup>1</sup> The Church of Rome asserted that she alone was the genuine apostolic Church for only she adhered to the faith as it was taught by the apostles, carried it on through direct succession and thus fulfilled the mission of Christ as given to the apostles, and was the same society as that founded by the apostles.<sup>2</sup> While Harding never systematically presented the Roman claims

---

XII; Robert McAfee Brown, The Spirit of Protestantism (New York: Oxford University Press, 1961), pp. 18-19; Daniel Jenkins, The Nature of Catholicity (London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1941), Chapters II, III.

1. The Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v. "Apostolicity," Vol. I, p. 648.

2. Cf. Dictionnaire De Théologie Catholique, s.v. "Apostolicite," J. Bainvel, Vol. I, second part, pp. 1617-1631; The Catholic Encyclopaedic Dictionary, Donald Attwater, editor, s. v. "Apostolicity," p. 30; Doctrine in the Church of England, p. 111.

to apostolicity in such exact terms, they were implicit in his position.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel defended the apostolicity of the Church of England on virtually the same grounds as Harding defended the Roman Church, but with major differences in interpretation. The true faith of Christ, the Reformer agreed, was to be found in the teachings of the apostles, but not in their teachings as conveyed through, and expounded by, the corrupt Roman Church. True apostolicity depended on holding the pure doctrines of the apostles as it was found in their original works: the Holy Scriptures. Jewel recalled the words of St. Cyprian to support this position: "If we return to the head and original of the heavenly tradition<sup>1</sup> which is the Word of God, 'all human error giveth place'."<sup>2</sup> For Jewel, apostolicity was dependent on the degree of adherence to the apostolic doctrines as related in the Scriptures, hence he repeatedly affirmed that an apostolic Church was that Church "where the authoritative writings of the Apostles are openly pronounced."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:1042, 1058.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1047; Cyprianus, Epistola ad Pompeium, X, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 1181-1182.

3. Jewel, op. cit., IV:1043-1044; Tertullianus,

An apostolic Church, in Jewel's opinion, also meant a Church which conformed to the doctrines and practices of the ancient Churches of the apostles. The belief that Rome was the only apostolic Church was unsubstantiated because all of the Churches founded by the apostles were "first Churches," and therefore were as apostolic as the Church of Rome. Jewel pointed out to his opponents:

The ancient godly fathers willed the faithful to have recourse unto every of these churches, of Smyra, of Ephesus, of Constantinople, of Alexandria, of Laodicea, of Tharsus, of Iconium, of Antioch, of Caesarea, of Melite, of Nice, of Scythia, of Martinopolis, of Corinthus, of Galatia, of Philippi, of Thessalonica, of Ephesus, and of Rome; not for any secret unremovable virtue in them contained, but only, as Irenaeus saith, "for that the tradition and doctrine of the apostles had continued there still without corruption."<sup>1</sup>

Because these early Churches had the teachings of the apostles so well preserved in them, it was to them that the Anglican Church had returned. This was

---

Liber De Praescriptionibus, Caput 36, in Opera Omnia, Vol. II, Col. 49.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1043; Irenaeus, Contra Haer., Liber III, Caput iii, 2, in Sancti Irenaei Opera, pp. 175-176.

the theme of Jewel's Reply, Apology, and his Defence of the Apology. "Let them (the Roman Catholics)," he said, "compare our churches and theirs together, and they shall see that themselves have most shamefully gone from the apostles, and we most justly have gone from them."<sup>1</sup> To Harding's unbounded pretensions on behalf of his Church, Jewel responded with vigor:

Ye have 'Ecclesiam Apostolicam,' ye say, and we have none; yet ye know in all these matters that we now entreat of, we have the old doctors' church, the ancient councils' church, the primitive church, St Peter's church, St Paul's church, and Christ's church. And this, I believe, unless ye can bring me good reason to the contrary, may be called the apostles' church.<sup>2</sup>

Though separated by time and geography, Jewel identified the apostolic Churches with the Church of England because their foundations were identical: "Our Saviour Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup>

#### V. SUMMARY

Jewel's attitude toward the traditional notes

- 
1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:891.
  2. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:61.
  3. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:1048.

of the Church was fundamentally different than that of the Church of Rome. He dissented from the Roman position by rejecting the four marks of the Church, i.e., unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity, as the primary method of defining the Church, and substituted instead the Protestant marks of the preaching of the Word, the right administration of the Sacraments, and proper ecclesiastical discipline. Even Jewel's qualified acceptance of denominating the Church "via notarum" was tempered by his break with the traditional interpretation through a broader, more spiritual definition of those notes.

Ignoring the mark of holiness, Jewel denied that unity was a true note of the Church if that unity involved acceptance of erroneous beliefs and a sacrifice of truth. He denied that catholicity was a note of the Church if catholicity was dependent on obedience to the Roman pontiff. He rejected the apostolicity of the Church as a true mark if to be apostolic, a Church was required to accept as the teaching of the apostles that which was handed down through the Bishop of Rome and his predecessors.

The standards by which the Church was to be judged were those marks of the Church as expressed



in the life and teaching of the pure Church of the first centuries. The unity experienced by this primitive Church was that which resulted from a common obedience to Christ as Head and Lord of His Church--His Body. Catholicity was not determined by the number of people holding a doctrine, or the length of time it had been held, but by whether the doctrine had been believed in the ancient Church by the apostles and catholic fathers. Likewise, the apostolicity of a Church was judged by her doctrinal agreement with the writings and teachings of the apostles in the Scriptures, not by so-called apostolic doctrines and practices handed down through the Church of Rome. Jewel believed that the Word of God contained the conclusive standards by which the Church of Christ should be judged.

## CHAPTER X

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH

Jewel's attitude toward the Church of Rome, as he considered the notes of the Church and identified himself and his Church with the Continental and Scottish Churches of the Reformation, is obvious. The Roman Church did not proclaim the Gospel because she no longer possessed the Word of God. She had become so involved in external rites and human traditions that she no longer exercised a preaching ministry of any kind. Because she did not hold the Gospel she could not administer the Sacraments properly. In addition, without the Word of God there could be no ecclesiastical discipline. Jewel, as previously noted, turned a deaf ear to Rome's exclusive claim to unity, holiness, catholicity, and apostolicity as she defined them, and instead demonstrated, on the basis of the Scriptures and the early Church, that she bore none of those marks of a Church of Christ.

From the foregoing, and what has been ascertained

of Jewel's general attitude regarding the Church, it would be logical to conclude that his position in reference to Rome was completely negative. Yet it must be remembered that in the topics treated in the previous chapters primary emphasis has been placed on their relation to Jewel's doctrine of the Church, and in order to see his view more clearly particular reference has been made to the often fundamental difference which existed between the Reformer's position and that of the Roman Catholic Church. Because he had been called upon to defend the Church of England specifically against the Church of Rome, it is only within this polemical context that his doctrinal position can be determined. It is unfortunate that this is so since it has led to the belief that Jewel was a militant Protestant Reformer, almost puritanical, hating all things pertaining to the Roman Church and denouncing her at every opportunity. Such a view, however, does not do justice to Jewel's true nature nor to his theology. Previous notice has been taken that Jewel occupied a "via media" within the Church of England, approaching issues with a combination of moderation and scholarship unusual in the sixteenth century. As a capable and well informed student of Church history, a conservative by

nature, and one whose life was marked by commendable restraint in an age where that virtue was often misinterpreted for weakness, the Bishop was never carried away to the same extremes as were others of his generation.<sup>1</sup>

In examining Jewel's position respecting the Roman Catholic Church, the following main points will be considered: his opinion of the early Roman Church; the subjection of Western Christendom, especially through councils, and the resulting corruptions; the pope and the antichrist; and finally a review of the position of the other major Reformers for comparative purposes.

---

1. Following are some examples of the prevalent attitudes in the sixteenth century Reformed community toward Rome: Cranmer described the Church of Rome as a "Most cruel stepmother" and the "true natural mother of antichrist," Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, edited for the Parker Society by John E. Cox, Vol. I, pp. 18-19. Bishop Bale spoke of the pope and Islam as together being the antichrist, and called the Roman Church the "mother of all whoredom," Select Works of John Bale, edited for the Parker Society by Henry Christmas (Cambridge: The University Press, 1849), pp. 426 ff. The Scottish Parliament referred to the pope as "the very antichrist and the son of perdition, of whom Paul speaks," Letter of Grindal to Bullinger, August 29th, 1567, in Zurich Letters, 1558-1579, p. 199. The Scots Confession of 1560 called the Church of Rome "the horrible harlot, the Kirk malignant." Article XVIII. Cf. H. F. Woodhouse, The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, pp. 154 ff.

## I. THE EARLY CHURCH OF ROME

Jewel, throughout his writings, assumed the accuracy of the tradition that Peter was the first bishop of Rome and never questioned the apostolicity of the Roman Church in the sense that she had been founded by the apostles, for this, he believed, was plainly taught in the Scriptures.<sup>1</sup> The Reformer acknowledged that the dignity and eminence of the Roman Church, in the early days of her history, was greater than that of other Churches, but he fully explained what he meant lest he be misunderstood or misinterpreted by either his friends or foes. The primary reason for

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:326 ff. In the course of his exposition of parts of II Thessalonians Jewel stated: "Here (II Thess. 2:5) we see how foully they are deceived, which say Peter was bishop of Rome, and did sit there five and twenty years. They that say so know not what they say. It is an error. Christ made Peter an apostle, and not to sit as a bishop in Rome." Works, II:908. In so saying the Reformer denied that Peter was a bishop for such an extended length of time; he was not affirming that Peter was never bishop of Rome. Calvin adopted the same attitude and also questioned Peter's supposed twenty-five year residence in Rome. Institutes, IV:vi:11-13. Luther, in declaring: "All popish histories say, Peter was the first Pope at Rome; but it is altogether false and feigned," did not deny that Peter was Rome's first bishop, but rather indicated that the office of pope as it was known in the Middle Ages was not the same as Peter had fulfilled in the first century. "Of Antichrist," in The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther, p. 257.



the greater dignity of the see of Rome was her association with the capital of the empire. The Bishop observed to Harding that

. . . the very cause why the church of Rome was placed in order and dignity before all others was not the word of Christ, as you imagine, but the empire and honour of that city, which then, in respect of worldly glory, was the lady and head of the world. And therefore in the council of Chalcedon it is written thus: "The fathers orderly gave the privilege of chieftly to the see of old Rome, because that city had the empire."<sup>1</sup>

To support this view he pointed out that when Constantinople was "honoured with empire and senate, as Rome was," the holy see of Constantinople had been called "new Rome," and enjoyed the same privileges that Rome enjoyed. It was as a result of the presence of the prince and the imperial seat that St. Augustine had said: "The see of Rome had the highest place and chief pre-eminence above others."<sup>2</sup>

Jewel presented other reasons for the high esteem in which the Roman Church had been held by the

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:306; Concilii Chalcedonensis, Canon XXVIII, in Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, p. 76.

2. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:370-371; Augustinus, Epistola XLIII, "Ad Glorio, Eleusio, Felicibus, Grammatico," Caput 3, 7, in Opera Omnia, Tom. II, p. 163.

ancient fathers:

It is true that as well St Augustine, as also other godly fathers rightly and well in old times yielded great reverence to the see of Rome, both for the antiquity of the church, and for the honour of St Peter, and for the constancy of the holy martyrs that there had suffered, and also for the purity of religion, which was preserved there a long time without spot, and might be a standard unto others.<sup>1</sup>

It was because of this doctrinal purity, Jewel asserted, that

. . . the emperors Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius commanded all them to be called catholics that follow the faith that St Peter delivered unto the see of Rome. For the apostles' doctrine is the trial and rule of faith. This doctrine at the beginning was exactly observed in Rome without corruption; and therefore was that Church in reverence and estimation above others.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel had no quarrel with the Roman Church of the first four or five centuries since in those times she had been

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:370; cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon I, pp. 32 ff. Calvin was not as ready as Jewel to ascribe to the old Church of Rome the same degree of leadership among the Churches of Christendom. He agreed that the Roman Church had been held in honor among the fathers because she had been founded by the apostles and was associated with the capital where there were men "more excellent in doctrine, prudence, skill and breath of experience," but he noted that the purity of doctrine and lack of "novelty" in the Roman Church was the result of those in the West being "less sharp and quick of wits" than those clerics in the East. Institutes, IV:vi:16.

2. Jewel, op. cit., I:365.

a stronghold of the faith and an example to all Christians.

In these statements the Bishop did not imply that the Roman Church had been perfect during the first half-millennium of her history. On the contrary, in his controversy he reminded his opponents of the many faults into which she had fallen, and made frequent reference to the statements and actions of over twenty-five bishops of the Roman see of that early period, sometimes with favor, more often however indicating wherein they had been in error. It was rather his contention that during those primitive times, the Church of Rome had not swerved radically from the basic tenets of the Gospel, and though at times mistaken, had always sought to reform herself.

Because of this desire after truth and her ability to set right those things wrong within her, Rome was used by the ancient fathers, and by Jewel himself, as a worthy model for other Churches to pattern themselves upon. On account of her ancient position and virtues the Reformer conceded that

. . . the bishop of Rome had an estimation, and a prerogative before others, . . . For of the four patriarchs he had the first place, both in council and out of council, and therefore was the greatest authority and direction of matters

in all assemblies. And this was τὸ πρῶτον, "to have the first or highest room;" and πρεσβυτεριον, "a dignity or privilege."<sup>1</sup>

This statement concerning the place of the early Roman Church introduces one of the keys to a proper understanding of Jewel's attitude toward the Church of Rome. He looked upon her as a catholic Church in her early days, existing among equal catholic Churches which in those ancient times turned to her as an example to emulate. He granted her the right to order her own affairs in her own way, but without imposing the Roman position on her sister Churches. These Churches, during the first five-hundred years, had given Rome that deference which was hers, not because of "de jure divino," but because of "custom."<sup>2</sup>

## II. SUBJECTION OF WESTERN CHRISTENDOM THROUGH COUNCILS

Throughout this work mention has been made repeatedly of the errors and heresies Jewel believed

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:375. Calvin acknowledged that "of old, Rome was indeed the mother of all churches." Institutes, IV:vii:24.

2. Jewel, op. cit., I:339-340.

to be in the Church of Rome. It is not the purpose of this section of the present chapter to repeat his allegations in detail, but rather to indicate their place in Jewel's appraisal of the Roman Church.

The Bishop believed that the basic error of the Church of Rome had its roots in her early history to which attention was drawn in the previous section. Jewel affirmed that the bishop of Rome had not been content to rule over his own diocese, but had, little by little, increased his control and added to his authority by taking advantage of the prestige of his see, until he claimed sovereignty over the entire Church of Christ, declaring that those out of communion with him were not of the catholic Church.

An example of the popes' unwarranted and illegal extension of their authority was evident to Jewel in the pontiffs' domination of the ecclesiastical councils of the previous thousand years. This intrusion colored the Reformer's attitude toward both the Roman Church and the general councils, especially as these councils were regarded as a possible method of correcting the errors which dominated the Church.

The Apologist's opponents never tired of drawing attention to England's non-attendance at the



Council of Trent, and observed that if the Anglicans had been interested in reform and in ridding the Church of supposed errors, the Council was the place to air their grievances.<sup>1</sup> Harding was characteristically straightforward:

Ye complain, the pope hath condemned you without judgment by order pronounced, and before ye were ever called to be judged. . . . Ye have been sundry times called to lawful consistories, to synods, to councils. Always, either ye made not your appearance, or by right of safe-conduct conveyed yourselves away, without any shew of obedience; or upon promise of amendment you were dismissed. How many legates and nuncios have sundry popes sent into Germany, and other provinces, to convert you, to hear you, to move you to a better mind, and to call you home, and with all merciful means to gather you again into the lap of the church? . . . But all was in vain, such hath been your stubbornness.<sup>2</sup>

It was true that England had ignored the Council of Trent and did not look to a general council as a place to seek reform, but yet, on principle, the Reformer was not opposed to councils as a basis of authority or as an instrument by which reform might be

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:205. Cf. Jewel, The Epistle to Scipio, Works, IV:1094. Though Ayre, the editor of Jewel's Works, makes an excellent case for Jewel's authorship of this Epistle, since it cannot be proved finally, it should be considered only in the light of Jewel's other works.

2. Harding, op. cit., IV:915.

effected. He had included "any old general council" in his Challenge Sermon as one of the authorities in which there was no support for Roman perversions of doctrine and practice.<sup>1</sup> Convocation and Parliament had been cited as the legal assemblies by which the Church of England had cast off the yoke of Rome and established the true faith of Christ in the land.<sup>2</sup> In answer to the allegations Harding presented, Jewel affirmed:

We do not fear and fly, but desire and wish for a council, so that it be free, honest, and christian; so that men meet as the apostles did; so that abbots and bishops be freed from the constraint of that oath by which they are now bound to the popes; . . . so that men of our part may be temperately and freely heard, and not condemned without being heard; so that one man may not have power to overthrow and repeal whatsoever is done.<sup>3</sup>

The qualifications in Jewel's answer are revealing. He and the Anglican Church generally mistrusted ecumenical councils both because of what they had done and what they had failed to do in past centuries.

1. See below, pp. 401-402.

2. Jewel, Epistle to Scipio, Works, IV:1122; see above, pp. 56 ff, 365-366; below,

3. Jewel, loc. cit.

For hundreds of years the councils of the Church had been dominated by the popes, whose confirmation was required for the validity of the councils' actions and formulations, an example of which was the Council of Trent's limitation of its decisions by the statement: "The authority of the apostolic see in all things evermore reserved."<sup>1</sup> If the pope possessed the Holy Spirit to the extent that he could confirm and overrule conciliar decisions, Jewel wondered why it was necessary for so many bishops to travel so far to do nothing.<sup>2</sup> Since the sixth century the decisions of councils had been notoriously untrustworthy. The second Council of Nicaea (787) was, in the Reformer's opinion, an "assembly of christian bishops so vain so peevish, so wicked, so blasphemous, so unworthy in all respects to be called a council," because "the blessed bishops there agreed together . . . that images in churches are not only to be allowed, but devoutly and reverently to be honoured, and that with the same honour that is due to God himself."<sup>3</sup> Jewel denounced the Council of

---

1. Council of Trent, Session VII, "Decree on Reformation," in Canons and Decrees, p. 58.

2. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:94.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:792; Council of

Constance (1414-1418) for having declared against the reception of communion in both kinds,<sup>1</sup> and for its condemnation of Wyclif and Valdo and the burning of John Huss "contrary to the emperor's safe conduct."<sup>2</sup> Because of its recency and anti-Reformation intent, the Council of Trent received the severest treatment of all by Jewel who recalled its totally unrepresentative nature, and its complete subjection to the interests of the papacy as evidence of its worthlessness.<sup>3</sup> It was an outstanding illustration of the general councils of the preceding ten centuries, termed by the Bishop as "wicked, and carried with malice,"<sup>4</sup> which had confirmed all of Rome's "gross and palable" errors.<sup>5</sup>

When Jewel mentioned "any old general council" he meant specifically the first four: Nicaea I (325), Constantinople I (381), Ephesus I (431), and Chalcedon

---

1. Jewel, Answer, Works, I:28, 63, 64; Concilium Constantiense, Sessio XIII, in Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta, p. 395.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:161, 163.

3. Jewel, Epistle to Scipio, Works, IV:1095-1096; Apology, Works, III:106; Defence, Works, IV:995-1006.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:177.

5. Ibid., III:216.

(451), although he implied approval of Constantinople II (553) which was within the limits he established in his Challenge Sermon by citing certain of its decrees with favor.<sup>1</sup> Yet he did not rely on these councils to support his position, but used them negatively to indicate that there was nothing in them to support the false Roman doctrines and traditions. As Southgate observes: Jewel "stated categorically that nothing could be alleged against the Church of England out of the first four councils while much could be cited from them expressly against the teachings of Rome."<sup>2</sup>

Jewel was reluctant to summon the aid of conciliar decrees in defence of his position for he realized that councils were made of fallible individuals, and no matter how pious and sincere these men might be,

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:300, 307, 404, IV: 841. Calvin also approved of the first four general councils "which were concerned with refuting errors--in so far as they relate to the teachings of the faith. For they contain nothing but the pure and genuine exposition of Scripture, which the holy fathers applied with spiritual prudence to crush the enemies of religion who had then arisen." Institutes, IV:ix:8. The first four general councils had been listed, with the Scriptures, as the basis for judging heresy in I Elizabeth Cap. 1: text in Gee and Hardy, Documents, No. LXXXIX, p. 455. Cf. Bullinger, Decades, Volume I, Sermon 1, p. 12.

2. W. M. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 133; Jewel, op. cit., III:225.



they were still capable of error. The good intentions of the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle had not resulted in the curtailment of papal abuses and power, nor had they recognized the godliness of Wyclif, Huss, or Valdo. The councils of the Church had not been consistent, and even Augustine, who wrote within "the first six hundred years" to which Jewel so frequently referred, had said: "The very general councils are often corrected, the former by the later, as often by trial and experience the thing is opened that before was shut."<sup>1</sup> Such sources of authority which required constant correction were not to be alleged in support of the Anglican position.<sup>2</sup>

If Jewel considered councils to be so unreliable, and often heretical, how could he cite those of the first five centuries, and especially the first four

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:177; Augustinus, "De Baptismo Contra Donatistas," Liber II, Caput III, 4, in Opera Omnia, Tom. IX, Col. 128-129.

2. Jewel's position regarding the place and authority of councils was essentially the same as that taken by the other Reformers, especially Calvin. See Institutes, IV:ix; Reply to Sadolet, in Calvin: Theological Treatises, p. 255; cf. Luther, Pagan Servitude, in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, p. 310.

general councils, as containing nothing against the Church of England? Could not these too have been as wrong as the Council of Trent, or as Harding suggested, could not "other councils . . . be received besides the first four?"<sup>1</sup> According to Jewel and the English Church, the early councils of the Church were accepted as guides because they were close to the time of the pure apostolic Church and had made their decisions solely on the basis of Holy Scripture. The decisions of the first four general councils were received because they were orthodox, and not vice versa. Councils, Jewel affirmed, did not devise truth; councils could only witness to that truth which had already been established by an absolute authority:

A council may testify the truth to be truth, but it cannot make falsehood to be truth. Augustine answered most indifferently, writing to Maximinus, a bishop of the Arians, that alleged a general council holden at Ariminum: "Neither may I lay to thee the council of Nice, nor mayest thou lay to me the council of Ariminum, either of us thinking thereby to find prejudice against the other; but let us lay matter to matter, cause to cause, and reason to reason, by the authority of the scriptures, which are indifferent witnesses for both."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:264.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:996; Augustinus, "Contra Maximium Axiarorum Episcopum," Liber II, Caput XIV, 3, in Opera Omnia, Tom. VII, Col. 772.

Jewel looked more favorably upon a provincial council than on a general council because of what such local bodies had accomplished in past years. In such gatherings there was greater opportunity for a full and free discussion, which the Reformer felt had been lacking in the recent general councils. In addition, there was less opportunity for domination by Rome in a meeting of a local body. On a number of occasions a provincial council had overruled the decrees of a general council, which supported his contention that often a local synod, such as the convocations of the English Church, could accomplish a reform which a general council had been unable to do. Jewel reminded Harding that God had often

. . . restored his church, and reformed abuses and heresies, by particular conference within several realms and countries; as we see by these private councils holden at Carthage under St Cyprian; at Neocaesaria in Pontus; at Ancyra in Galatia; at Gangra in Paphlagonia; and by other like, without any consent of a general council.<sup>1</sup>

Through Rome's control of the councils of the Church the infection of her heresies had spread over Western Christendom until she was acknowledged as supreme and her bishop's sovereignty honored with

---

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:322. These councils mentioned by Jewel were all held before the middle of the third century.

such titles as "universal bishop" and "vicar of Christ," Jewel, in his famous Challenge Sermon outlined these errors which had been received into the Church of Rome and with which the remainder of his works were concerned. Though the quotation is lengthy, it is appropriate that it be included at this point in order to see clearly and concisely the nature of his differences with Rome. He challenged his opponents thus:

If any learned man of all our adversaries, or if all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old catholic doctor or father, or out of any old general council, or out of the holy scriptures of God, or any one example of the primitive church: whereby it may be clearly and plainly proved, that there was any private mass in the whole world at that time for the space of six hundred years after Christ; or that there was then any communion ministered to the people under one kind; Or that the people had their common prayers then in a strange tongue that they understood not; Or that the bishop of Rome was then called universal bishop, or the head of the universal church; Or that the people was then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally, in the sacrament; Or that the sacrament was then, or ought now to be, hanged up under a canopy; Or that in the sacrament after the words of consecration there remaineth only the accidents and shews, without the substance of bread and wine; Or that the priest then divided the sacrament in three parts, and afterward received himself all alone; Or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been judged for a heretic; Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten or five masses said in one church in one day; Or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people



might worship them; or that the lay people was then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue--if any man alive were able to prove any of these articles by any one clear or plain clause or sentence . . . I promise then that I would give over and subscribe unto him.<sup>1</sup>

So serious were these corruptions that Jewel included the Roman Church among the Anabaptists and "rebels at Munster;" all, he claimed, were heretics.<sup>2</sup> An indication of the serious nature of the many Roman heresies is seen in his exposition of II Thessalonians, especially his comments on verse three of the second chapter: "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a departing first, and that man of sin be disclosed, even the son of perdition."<sup>3</sup> These prophecies of the Apostle Paul, the Bishop affirmed, had been fulfilled in Rome's abandonment of the faith of Christ:

Whosoever considereth these and such other great errors,<sup>4</sup> must needs confess that the church of

---

1. Jewel, Challenge, Works, I:20-21.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:665; see above, pp. 260-263.

3. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:900.

4. The specific errors to which here here referred were: driving "the people from reading the scriptures," teaching men "to put confidence in those creatures, which cannot profit or help them," and the belief that Mary was the mediator between man and Christ. Ibid., II: 899-900.



Rome hath wrought that departing whereof the apostle speaketh. In the late council of Trident, Cornelius, the bishop of Bitonto, did something plainly acknowledge the great apostacy and departing of the church of Rome, both in matters of the faith and in conversation and life. These be his words: "Would God they were not gone wholly with general consent from religion to superstition, from faith to infidelity, from Christ to antichrist, from God to Epicure; saying with wicked heart and filthy mouth, there is no God. Neither hath there been this great while any pastor or pope that regarded these things, for they all," both pope and cardinals and other, "sought their own; and not so much as one of them sought for the things that pertain to Jesus Christ."<sup>1</sup>

In the Reformer's estimation the Roman Church was guilty of heresy, schism, and the more serious charge of apostacy. In leaving her fellowship, he described the Anglican Church as having

. . . departed therefore from shepherds that spoiled the flock; from bishops that destroyed the church, that oppressed the Spirit of God, that defied the voice of the prophets, that persecuted Christ in his members, that both perished themselves and killed others, that wallowed in monsters of filthiness, that lived as heathens under the name of Christ, that were void of religion, that were Christians only in titles and ceremonies; from whom Christ had withdrawn his blessing: to be short, we have departed from the temple of heresy, and from the school of error.<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:900. Quotation from "Oratio R. P. D. Cornelii Episcopi Bitontini," in Conciliorum Omnium (Coloniae Agrippinae, 1551), Vol. III, p. 979. Italics mine.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:875.

### III. THE POPE AND THE ANTICHRIST

In order to indicate the depths of sin into which the Roman see had fallen, Jewel often suggested that she was that desolation, and the pope was that antichrist which had been prophesied in the Scripture and by the fathers. The Bishop, after discussing the great pretensions and claims made by the Roman pontiff, called attention to the ways in which the coming antichrist had been described:

This shall be the mark whereby you may know him: he shall set himself against God and against Christ; . . . He will not openly speak his blasphemies, or spit at the gospel of God, or defy the name of Christ; but he will call himself "the servant of God's servants," or perhaps "the head or the chief member of the church." He shall say he is led with zeal of God's house, and shall do nothing less; for he shall seek himself. He shall say he seeketh the glory of God, when all that he doth is for the enriching and ambitious enlarging of his own worldly pomp and vanity.<sup>1</sup>

The prophecies concerning antichrist's attitude toward the people of God and temporal governments were also pointedly quoted by the Apologist:

He selleth merits, the forgiveness of sins, the sacrifice for the quick and the dead, He maketh

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:903.

merchandise of the souls of men, He layeth his filthy hands on the Lord's anointed. He removeth kings, and deposeth the states and princes of the world. This is antichrist . . . So shall he sit in the temple of God. The people shall wonder at him, and shall have him in reverence . . . So intolerable and monstrous shall be his pride.<sup>1</sup>

Thus, since Jewel described the Bishop of Rome and the antichrist who had been spoken of in the Scriptures in identical terms, it is reasonable to assume that, for him, the pope and the antichrist were one and the same, and the Church of Rome as his kingdom was the Babylon of which the writers of Scripture had spoken.

Professor Norman Sykes has stated that "the Church of England avowedly as a matter of both fact and sentiment was closer to the Roman Church than any other of the churches which had renounced its obedience at the Reformation."<sup>2</sup> This attitude, he continues, despite Jewel's condemnation of the corruptions and excesses of the Roman see, was reflected in the Reformer's treatment of the Roman Church:

It was implicit in Jewel's challenge that the Roman church stripped of such excrescences and corruptions, held the fundamentals of faith,

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:905.

2. Norman Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter, p. 178.

and was therefore still a branch of Christ's universal church, albeit in present need of purgation and reform.<sup>1</sup>

This judgment, it will be seen, was basically correct, though Jewel was not as charitable toward Rome as Sykes might lead us to believe.

Jewel obviously came close to calling the pope the antichrist, but his moderate and cautious nature, together with his view of the nature of the Church and the power of God, would not let him arrive at such damning conclusions. Even though his words pointed to this identification, he stopped short of that conclusion, saying:

Here, methinketh, I see the secret motions of your heart. You look that I should name the bishop of Rome, that it is he which hath suffered himself to be called by the name of God. I will not tell you in my own words. Unless the bishop himself so speak, I will not tell you.<sup>2</sup>

Despite all the facts pointing to the pope as the fulfillment of the prophecies concerning the antichrist, Jewel declared: "I will not say the pope is antichrist. God will reveal him in his time, and he shall

---

1. Sykes, Old Priest and New Presbyter, p. 180.

2. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:906.

be known."<sup>1</sup>

The Bishop was purposely somewhat ambiguous and evasive on what he believed the exact degree of apostasy of the Roman Church to be. For him, the final apostasy was identification of the pope as God; beyond this there could be no greater error, and from this there could be no return to truth. He found hints of these ultimate papal claims in statements of, and honors accepted by, various popes,<sup>2</sup> but he felt that Rome had not, up to that time, committed this unforgivable sin. The pope had given himself a "presumptuous, a profane, a sacrilegious, and an antichristian name;" he was the "king of pride, . . . Lucifer, which preferroth himself before his brethren;" he had "forsaken the faith," yet he was not the antichrist, but was instead his "forerunner."<sup>3</sup> Jewel used this word to show

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:714.

2. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:906: "Pope Nicholas saith: 'It is well known that the pope of the godly prince Constantine was called God.' . . . The pope was well content to suffer Christopher Marcellus, one of his parasites in the council of Laterane, to say unto him: 'Thou art another God on earth.' . . . In the extravagantes it is set down: 'Our Lord God the pope'."

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:316. Jewel's phrase was "esse praecursorem antichristi." He may have been implying that the pope's relation to the antichrist was



that the Church of Rome had severed herself so far from the Church of Christ that it had become absolutely necessary to leave her fellowship in order to return to Christ Himself; but she had not departed to such an extent that she was beyond hope or redemption.

It should be noted that for Jewel's apologetic purposes the Church of Rome was identified with the papacy, for it was the papacy which was more vulnerable to the Reformer's attack than the Church.<sup>1</sup> But a careful reading of Jewel's works will show that he made a distinct, if not always obvious, difference between the Church of Rome and the papacy, between the institution and her errors. As it has been said that God loves the sinner, but hates his sin, so it could be said that Jewel thought highly of the ancient Roman Church, but hated the sins that had come to possess her. Since the basic fault which was the root of all others within this Church was the institution of the papacy

---

the same as John the Baptist's relation to Christ, since "praecursor" had been used by Augustine in describing the mission of John. See Augustinus, In Joannis Evangelium Tractatus, IV, 6, 8, in Opera Omnia, Tom. III, Col. 1408-1409.

1. See W. M. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 213.

and all it implied, the only salvation for the Church was to be found in the abolition of this corrupt and corrupting force. Jewel asserted: "We do not despise the church of these men (howsoever it be ordered by them now-a-days), partly for the name's sake, and partly for that the gospel of Jesus Christ hath once been therein truly and purely set forth,"<sup>1</sup> for it was not "the church that we find fault withal, but the great corruptions and foul deformities" which she contained.<sup>2</sup>

Jewel left no doubt as to what he believed these "foul deformities" had done to the once-revered Church of Rome:

Let us look into the church of Rome, and behold the usage and behaviour thereof. Where shall we find that heavenly comliness which St Paul requireth? Where is the comfortable reading of the scriptures? Where is the people taught their salvation in Christ Jesus? Where is the brotherly meeting of all the congregation at the communion of the Lord's supper? May we say of Rome that it holdeth fast the form and fashion of that church which Christ and his apostles left unto us, and which the holy ancient fathers continued? nay, rather, . . . we may say: it is not

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:709.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:222.

now a house of prayer, but a den of thieves.  
We may say: it shall no more be called bethel,  
the house of God, but Bethaven, the house of  
vanity, or of lying.<sup>1</sup>

He argued with Harding:

For Rome is not the body, but only a member of  
that body: Rome is not the tree, but only a  
bough: Rome is not the head, but only a spring;  
and therefore, seeing it is now divided from  
that Head, it is no marvel, though it be starved,  
though it be withered, though it be left dry,  
without either spirit or life; as this day it  
appeareth to the eyes of all them that will be-  
hold it.<sup>2</sup>

Yet despite all that Jewel said about the de-  
plorable condition of the Church of Rome, and it can-  
not be denied that he viewed her state as grave, there  
remained a certain reluctance in his attitude, a  
hesitation lest he go too far and overstate his case.  
He was careful when quoting another whose position  
went beyond his own, to use those words in support of  
his own views without indicating that he fully agreed  
with the authority quoted. This is evident in his use  
of the testimony of those who believed that the pope  
was the antichrist, without committing himself to their  
belief.<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:898.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1072.

3. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:896 ff.

#### IV. OTHER REFORMERS ON THE ROMAN CHURCH

Most of Jewel's fellow Reformers were more radical in their criticisms and judgments of the Church of Rome than was the Apologist. Calvin and Bullinger referred without hesitation to the pope as the antichrist, but Luther, of the major Reformers, was the most scathing in his castigation of the see of Rome and the papacy. Luther's early respect and confidence evidenced toward Pope Leo became increasingly less apparent as it became obvious to him that a reform of the Roman Church was impossible.<sup>1</sup> Eventually his complete disillusionment with the papacy led him not only to identify the pope with the antichrist, but with the infidel Turk as well:

The head of Antichrist is the Pope, and the Turk together. For a living beast must have a body and soul; the spirit or soul of Antichrist, is the Pope, but his flesh, or body, is the Turk. This devasteth, destroyeth, and persecuteth God's church corporally; the Pope

1. See Martin Luther, "An Open Letter to Pope Leo X" (1520), in Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, pp. 333-337; "Of the Antichrist or Pope," in The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther, pp. 251-275. This latter work is undated, but the contents indicate that it was probably written by Luther during the pontificate of Clement VII (1523-1534).

spiritually; yea also corporally, with hanging, burning, murdering, &c . . . concerning the manner of religion under the Pope and the Turn, there is no difference, but only in ceremonies,<sup>1</sup>

Luther was not satisfied with this judgment; he continued: "Seeing the Pope is the Antichrist, I believe that he is a devil incarnate; for as like Christ is true and natural God and man, even so is the Antichrist a living devil."<sup>2</sup>

Calvin was more temperate, scholarly, and less emotional in his appraisal of the Church of Rome and the papacy. He too believed that the prophecies in Daniel, II Thessalonians, and Revelation pointed to the pope as the antichrist. "To some," he said,

. . . we seem slanderers and railers when we call the Roman Pontiff "Antichrist." But those who think so do not realize they are accusing Paul of intemperate language. . . . Since, therefore, it is clear that the Roman Pontiff has shamelessly transferred to himself what belonged to God alone and especially to Christ, we should have no doubt that he is the leader and standard-bearer of that impious and hateful kingdom.<sup>3</sup>

A further indication of Calvin's opinion of the Roman Church is his extreme reluctance to separate from her,

---

1. Martin Luther, "Of the Antichrist or Pope," in The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther, pp. 251-252.

2. Ibid., p. 252.

3. Calvin, Institutes, IV:vii:25.



except as a final measure.<sup>1</sup> As long as a particular Church retained the preaching of the Word of God and the proper observance of the Sacraments; in spite of disorders,<sup>2</sup> scandals,<sup>3</sup> and toleration of wicked persons,<sup>4</sup> Calvin believed there was no cause for schism. Yet the Church of Rome had separated herself so far from the Church of God that these marks were no longer evident, and separation from her was not only permissible--it was absolutely necessary.<sup>5</sup>

Bullinger was as adamant as Calvin on the evil of schism. For him too, as long as a Church retained the marks of the true Church of Christ, separation from that body was unjustified, even though that Church contained a diversity of indifferent doctrines, clergy and laity leading immoral lives, and a variety of ceremonies.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, departure from the Roman Church

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:i:12-16.

2. Ibid., IV:vii:12

3. Ibid., IV:i:13.

4. Ibid., IV:i:15.

5. Ibid., IV:ii:10.

6. Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon 2, pp. 56 ff.

had been commanded<sup>1</sup> because she had neither the inward nor the outward marks of the Church of God.<sup>2</sup> Bullinger also interpreted the prophecies of the Scriptures regarding the antichrist as having been fulfilled in the pope, declaring: "The supremacy of the pope is flatly repugnant to the doctrine of the gospel and of the apostles."<sup>3</sup>

But despite the heresy these divines believed to be in the Church of Rome, with Jewel, they would not say that she was beyond recovery or that there was nothing left of the true Church in her. Luther, though lashing out against the unspeakable errors of Rome, did not deny her a place in the catholic Church:

So we too at this present day call the Roman Church holy and all its episcopal offices holy, although they are misdirected and those who hold them are ungodly. For "God rules in the midst of His enemies" (Ps. 110:2); Antichrist "sitteth in the temple of God" (II Thessalonians 2:4); and Satan is present in the midst of the children of God. Even if the Church is "in the midst of a perverse and crooked generation," as Paul says in Phillipians (2:15), even if it finds itself among wolves and robbers (cf. John 10), that is, among spiritual tyrants, yet it is none the less the Church. Although the city of Rome

---

1. Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon 2, p. 76.

2. Ibid., pp. 66 ff.

3. Ibid., Sermon 3, p. 121.

is worse than Sodom and Gomorrha, yet there remain there Baptism, Sacrament, the Holy Scripture, the churchly offices, Christ's name and God's name . . . Therefore the Roman Church is holy, because it has God's name, the Gospel, Baptism, etc. If these things are found in a people, that people is called holy.<sup>1</sup>

Bullinger, although not as explicit as Luther, recognized that within the "upstart Romish Church of the pope" there was true baptism "in the name of the Trinity to the articles of the Catholic faith."<sup>2</sup> He also admitted that not all things used by the Church of Rome were corrupt, for her use of the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the canonical Scriptures did not prevent their use by the Reformed Churches.<sup>3</sup>

For Calvin the Roman Catholic Church was not the Church of Christ, but he conceded that within her were "vestigia ecclesiae." Being less inclined to excess than Luther and more systematic than Bullinger in the treatment of the Roman Church, he affirmed:

In like manner, today we do not deprive the papists of those traces of the church which the Lord willed should among them survive the

1. Luther, In Epistolam S. Pauli ad Galatas Commentarius, in D. Martin Luther's Werke (Weimar: 1911), Vol. XL, I, pp. 69 f. Cf. Concerning Rebaptism, in Luther's Works, Vol. 40, pp. 231-232.

2. Bullinger, Decades, Volume IV, Sermon 1, p. 22.

3. Ibid.

destruction . . . When those countries (France, Italy, Germany, Spain, and England) were oppressed by the tyranny of Antichrist, the Lord used two means to keep his covenant inviolable; consecrated by his own mouth, it retains its force despite the impiety of men. Secondly, by his own providence he caused other vestiges to remain, that the church might not utterly die. And just as often happens when buildings are pulled down the foundations and ruins remain, so he did not allow his church either to be destroyed to the very foundations by Antichrist, or to be leveled to the ground, . . . but even after this very destruction willed that a half-demolished building remain.<sup>1</sup>

Thus in Calvin's opinion there were true Churches to be found among the Churches of the Roman see.<sup>2</sup> In these Churches, he said, "Christ lies hidden, half buried, the gospel overthrown, piety scattered, the worship of God wiped out (yet) . . . some marks of the church remain."<sup>3</sup>

## V. SUMMARY

The reticence on the part of the sixteenth century Reformers to state categorically that the Church of Rome had no part in the Church of Christ was a result

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:11. Parenthesis mine.

2. See Calvin, Reply to Sadoleto, in Calvin: Theological Treatises, p. 241.

3. Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:12.

of their doctrine of the nature of the Church and their belief in the sovereignty of God. Even though the visible, institutional Church was an expression of that invisible, spiritual Body of Christ, it was only an expression, and no matter how corrupt the institution might become, the true Church of faith always existed within her--sometimes large, at other times limited to but a few. God was at all times Lord of His Church, and as Calvin expressed it: "(He) wonderfully preserves in them (individual congregations) a remnant of his people, however woefully dispersed and scattered" they be.<sup>1</sup> These Churches, he continued, retained "those marks whose effectiveness neither the devil's wiles nor human depravity can destroy."<sup>2</sup>

If these Reformers had professed a belief that the true Church ceased to exist through the apostacy of the Roman Church, they would, in effect, have affirmed a belief that the devices of men could foil God's will and destroy His Church. This, to such men as Jewel and Calvin, was unthinkable. Men could never

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:ii:12.

2. Ibid.



outwit God, and falsehood could never overcome truth.

Such convictions carried more weight with these Reformers than the heresy, apostacy, and schism which they denounced in the Church of Rome. Jewel was one with Luther, Bullinger, and Calvin in the belief that the Roman Church had fallen from Christ. He defended the separation from such an institution, though he was loath to condone schism of any kind.<sup>1</sup> Yet because of his overriding belief in the purpose of God, he did not abandon all hope of the return of the Church of Rome to her original purity and position. This position had been as "a part of the universal mystical body of Christ, which is the church,"<sup>2</sup> with her own rites, traditions, ceremonies, and a bishop who was "a branch of the vine,"<sup>3</sup> "a member of that body, . . . a subject of that kingdom, . . . a child of God,"<sup>4</sup> and a bishop among his brother-bishops.<sup>5</sup> Jewel implied

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:77.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:922; "Oratio Luculonia Praesidentis," Basilcensis Concilii, appendix, in Concilia Omnia, Tom. III, p. 302; italics mine.

3. Jewel, op. cit., IV:918. 4. Ibid., III:271.

5. Ibid., IV:956.

that it was possible for the Roman pontiff to be reconciled to God,<sup>1</sup> and for the Church of Rome once again to "faithfully keep the traditions and doctrine of the apostles."<sup>2</sup> As Calvin had spoken of the Roman Church as a building whose only remains were ruins and foundations, Jewel described her, in the words of Chrysostom, as "chests and coffers wherein the treasure was sometimes kept," but the treasure they no longer had.<sup>3</sup>

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1085.

2. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:365.

3. Jewel, II Thessalonians, Works, II:898; Chrysostomus, Epistolam I ad Corinthios, Homilia XXXVI, Commentaria In Novum Testamentum, Vol. V, p. 405 (Opera, Vol. VI).

## CHAPTER XI

### CHURCH AND STATE

When Jewel set about to vindicate the Church of England in her separation from the Roman see, he was in the position of having to defend an establishment which he had no hand in effecting, and with which he was not in total agreement. He knew that the separation from Rome, accomplished during the reign of Henry VIII, was brought about chiefly for political, rather than for religious reasons. It was plain that Henry had used the Scriptures to justify an action which was politically expedient, and not as the incentive or inspiration for that action.<sup>1</sup> After the Church of England had been declared to be an independent, national, ecclesiastical entity her divines were called upon to show theological warrant for that which had already happened, and to lend religious support to the basically political assertion of the supreme authority

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

1. See above, pp. 56-59, 88-90.

of the King over both the temporal and spiritual. With the exception of the five-year reign of Mary, the Royal Supremacy, since the Act of Supremacy in 1534, was both a direct and indirect means whereby the Church of England took on an increasingly Protestant character. The freedom from the bishop of Rome which the Church enjoyed, coupled with the strong Protestant convictions of many of her outstanding ecclesiastical leaders, was, to the papists, an invincible combination. Because the royal supremacy had been responsible for this return to the true faith, the Protestant-minded Reformers, with good conscience, could bend every effort toward supporting, on the basis of Scripture and ancient practice, an orthodox position, which under less cooperative and sympathetic rulers would have been impossible for the sincere and conscientious.

Though much happened in England between Henry's "Act of Supremacy" and what has come to be known as the Elizabethan Settlement, the solution of the religious question during Elizabeth's reign was almost identical to that under Henry, as far as the relation between the Church and the State was concerned. If anything, as T. M. Lindsay suggests,

. . . the ecclesiastical jurisdiction bestowed upon Elizabeth was more extensive than that given to her father, for "schisms" were added to the list of matters subject to the Queen's correction, and she was empowered to delegate her authority to commissioners--a provision which enabled her to exercise her supreme governorship in a way to be felt in every corner of the land.<sup>1</sup>

This Settlement, "regarded in the light of later history," as Maurice Powicke observes, "deserves and has received as much attention as any other movement in this all important period."<sup>2</sup> Inasmuch as this is certainly true, it is not the purpose of this chapter to consider the resolution of the religious problem under Elizabeth in detail, but to examine the way in which it was championed by Jewel and to note his qualifications regarding the power of the prince necessitated by his doctrine of the Church.

#### I. THE AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RULER

---

1. T. M. Lindsay, History of the Reformation, Vol. II, p. 394.

2. Maurice Powicke, The Reformation in England (London: Oxford University Press, 1941), p. 125. For a comprehensive treatment of the Settlement see J. V. P. Thompson, Supreme Governor (London: SPCK, 1940); J. E. Neale, Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581



## A. THE SOURCE OF AUTHORITY

Henry's appeal to antiquity for justification of the position that England was, and had always been, a free and sovereign empire was echoed in Jewel's affirmation that the foundations of Christianity in England had been free from Roman domination. He asserted that those claims alleging that Augustine of Canterbury, whom he described as a "hypocrite, a superstitious man, cruel, bloody, and proud above measure,"<sup>1</sup> had been responsible for bringing the Christian faith to Britain were untrue. "It appeareth plainly," he declared, "by sundry the ancient fathers . . . that the faith of Christ had been universally received, and perfectly rooted in this realm many hundred years before this Augustine the monk was born."<sup>2</sup> Indeed, this "monk of Rome" was responsible for bringing to England "great

---

(London: Jonathan Cape, 1953); Lacey B. Smith, Tudor Prelates and Politics (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953); C. Sydney Carter, "The Anglican 'Via Media': A Study in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement," The Church Quarterly Review, Vol. XCVII (October 1923; January 1924), pp. 233-254; Carl S. Meyer, Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559.

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:300.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:778.

heaps of strange novelties and superstitions, as candles, candlesticks, banners, and holy water, and other like shews, whereof the church of God had no great need."<sup>1</sup>

Though he was not sure who had first brought the Gospel to England: it might have been by "Joseph of Arimathea, or . . . by St Paul the apostle, . . . or . . . by Simon Zelotes, or by the Greeks, or by some others,"<sup>2</sup> one thing was certain--beyond any doubt the Church of Rome had nothing to do with Christianity's first advent to the Island.

Jewel's purpose in pointing out this original independence from Rome was twofold. First, since the Christian faith had already been established by the time of Augustine's arrival at the end of the sixth century, the Roman pontiff could not claim dominion over the English Church because of foundation. The Church of Rome therefore had no right to attempt to

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:778.

2. Ibid., III:163-164; cf. III:165, 267; Reply, Works, I:200, 307. Elizabeth affirmed that the Christian faith had been brought first to the land by Joseph of Arimathea. See Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 150.

prevent the Church of England returning to that original God-ordained relation between the Church and the State which had existed in the first Christian centuries. Secondly, the Bishop indicated that it was the coming of Augustine, as the pope's representative and missionary, which had initiated the process of decay in the Church, which steadily increased until the Church of England had returned to truth at the time of the Reformation.

Having demonstrated that the founding of the Anglican Church owed nothing to the see of Rome, and that by right she was an independent Church of Christ under no obligation to the pope, the Reformer proceeded to defend the outstanding feature of the English Reformation--the Royal Supremacy. Against Harding's statement that royal power came "by the positive laws of nations, not by supernatural grace from God, as priests have,"<sup>1</sup> Jewel defended, on both theological

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:1035. In stating this view, Harding was not reflecting accurately the Roman Catholic position. If, as Roman doctrine affirmed, both the temporal and spiritual swords originated in God, the latter being exercised by the clergy and the former by the prince, all under the pope as stated by Boniface in his "Una Sanctam," then even in orthodox

and historical grounds, his belief that "the king's majesty justly and rightly is and ought to be the supreme head of the church of England."

Jewel was expounding no radical doctrine when he affirmed the prince's sovereignty over the Church or when he stated: "Touching the prince's power, we are certainly assured by God's holy word it is from God."<sup>1</sup> He defended the supremacy of the monarch on the same grounds that Boniface VIII, in the "Una Sanctam," defended the papacy.<sup>2</sup> Whereas Boniface affirmed that the

Roman thought the prince exercised rule by divine authority, albeit by the pope's leave, and not as Harding believed by "the positive law of nations." To those words of Harding, Hughes states that Jewel can only respond: "Untruths, three together, open and manifest," and "This is your Lomanian divinity, M. Harding." The Reformation in England, Vol. III, p. 76. Although in a footnote Hughes points out: "For all this cf. the Defence (1567) in Jewel, IV, 1035, 1036," he leaves the reader with the false idea of Jewel's reply. Hughes is correct in reporting Jewel's words, but fails to indicate that his first quotation is Jewel's answer, written in the margin of Harding's text, which is immediately followed by the words, which Hughes did not quote: "Read the answer." Defence, IV:1035. This "answer" of Jewel's consisted of two full pages of support for the Anglican position in which are the words of Hughes' second quotation, proving that he was acquainted with the Reformer's complete answer. For a further criticism of Hughes' treatment of Jewel and the Anglican viewpoint, see Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, pp. 51-52, note 7; pp. 52-53, note 8.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1037.

2. See J. N. Figgis, The Theory of the Divine

bishop of Rome hold both the temporal and spiritual swords given him by God; the Reformer asserted that the prince was "keeper of the law of God, and that of both tables, as well of the first, that pertaineth to religion, as of the second, that pertaineth to good order."<sup>1</sup> The papacy applied the words of Proverbs 8:15: "By me and my authority kings bear rule over their subjects" to itself,<sup>2</sup> while the Bishop claimed that in this verse was the Anglican warrant for the prince's supremacy over all estates.<sup>3</sup> Jewel reasoned, had not Jesus said to Pilate: "Thou shouldest have no power over me, were it not given thee from above," or had not St. Paul said: "There is no power but from God?"<sup>4</sup> God had chosen civil rulers and had sent them

---

Right of Kings (Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1896), pp. 97-98.

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:997.

2. See "Tractatus cum Bonifacio VIII. Papa," 1300 Mai 13, in Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum et Regum, Jacobus Schwall, editor (Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1906), Tom. IV, no. 105, p. 80.

3. Jewel, An Epistle to Queen Elizabeth, Works, III:117.

4. Ibid.



to govern in His name.<sup>1</sup> Jewel quoted the words of Tertullian to indicate the attitude of the Church of England toward her sovereign: "We worship the emperor as a man next unto God, and inferior only unto God."<sup>2</sup>

Jewel had no difficulty in finding numerous historical examples of rulers who had exercised their God-given right over both spiritual and temporal affairs that might be cited in defence of the policy of the English Church. Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Jehosaphat, Jehoshaphat, Joash, and Jehu were attested in support from the Old Testament,<sup>3</sup> while Justinian,<sup>4</sup> Constantine,<sup>5</sup> Theodosius I, Theodosius II, and Martin afforded illustrations from early Church history.<sup>6</sup> These examples of the sovereign wielding authority over both ecclesiastical leaders and councils of the

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:704.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:997; cf. Defence, Works, IV:975; Tertullianus, Libor ad Scapulam, Caput II, in Opera Omnia, Vol. I, Col. 700.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:98.

4. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1033.

5. Ibid., III:167.

6. Ibid., IV:992.

Church proved conclusively to Jewel that it was the Roman Church which had erred in claiming dominion over all estates, while the Anglican Church had returned to primitive practice.

With both the Scriptures and the tradition of the early Church to bolster his position, the Reformer declared emphatically that the prince was "the head of the people not only of commons and laity, but also of the ministers and clergy."<sup>1</sup> The system which had been permitted to exist in England between the sixth century and the time of the Reformation, wherein the clergy of the commonwealth were responsible to the bishop of Rome, while the laity were ruled by the temporal sovereign, was in reality an intervention of a foreign power in matters which were the sole right of the English ruler. Any rights which the bishops, or other clergy, had to judge in ecclesiastical matters were not inherent rights from God, according to Jewel, but rather they "proceeded only of special favour" of the prince whose exclusive right it was to dispense justice to all his subjects. The Bishop's whole attitude was summed

---

1. Jewel, Sermon on Haggai, Works, II:997.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:959; cf. 963-969.

up succinctly: "Every prince is bound in the whole to see the reformation of his own church and country."<sup>1</sup>

Jewel was no mere theorist in acknowledging the prince as responsible for both Church and State; he also recognized that there was a twofold responsibility in effecting a reformation. As it was the duty of the prince to see to the reformation and government of all affairs within the realm, so it was the obligation of those under their sovereign to heed God's call and fulfill their responsibility in their given station in society. "It becometh every man," Jewel affirmed,

. . . when he is in secret and alone, to bothink himself whereto God hath called him. The magistrate thus: I am called to do justice, to be merciful to the widow, to have pity upon the fatherless: I am the minister of God for the wealth of them that do well, and to take vengeance on him that doth evil. The minister and preacher thus: I have charge given me to lead the people of God to the way of righteousness: I am called to do the work of an evangelist, to preach the word in season and out of season, to show the people their offences, and to reprove them with all earnestness, to teach them to deny all ungodliness, and turn wholly unto God . . . The subject must thus think with himself: I owe obedience to my sovereign: I must be subject, not because of wrath only, but also for conscience sake. If I resist, I resist the ordinance of God, and shall receive to myself damnation.<sup>2</sup>

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:323.

2. Jewel, I Thessalonians, Works, II:861-862.

Each individual within the commonwealth was called to his particular task and in that vocation he was duty-bound to yield obedience to his God-sent sovereign.

The Apologist declared:

This . . . is our profession, this is our doctrine, that every soul, of what calling soever it be, be it monk, be it preacher, be it prophet, be it apostle, ought to be subject to kings and magistrates; . . . Our common teaching also is, that we ought to obey princes as men sent of God.<sup>1</sup>

To demonstrate that this belief was actually practiced in the Church of England, Jewel noted that her members, as loyal subjects, honored and respected their ruler, and unlike the situation often caused by the Roman Church in many lands, there had been no disorders or rebellions in England because of conflicts arising between ecclesiastical and temporal leaders.<sup>2</sup>

#### B. THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE RULER

Jewel's conviction regarding the God-ordained position of the prince, one second only to that of God Himself, over his subjects, and the consequent obedience required of the subject in his particular station in

FOOTNOTES

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, IV:703-704.

2. Ibid., III:76, IV:668-669, 1076-1077.

life, whether lay or clerical, lord or commoner, was the result of a practical as well as a theological concern. He saw that only with the Queen's cooperation could anything like the desired reformation of the Church be accomplished, and he fearlessly reminded Elizabeth that, just as her subjects were bound by God's law to submit to her, she had been divinely placed in her exalted position to further the cause of Christ and His people. The Bishop took every opportunity to call Elizabeth to her obligations toward the Church--a fundamental responsibility of which was for the ministry. He declared, attesting many Old Testament examples of kings and princes who deposed and established high priests: "It pertaineth therefore also to kings and princes to send out laborers into the harvest," adding: "As God calleth him inwardly in the heart whom he will have to be a minister of his word, so must he be authorized of his prince by outward and civil calling."<sup>1</sup>

In these statements regarding the sovereign's responsibility the Apologist expressed several basic beliefs concerning the prince's duties. The Reformer

1. Jewel, On Matthew 2:32, 36, Works, II:1022.



was demonstrating the orderliness by which the ministry of the Church of England was commissioned. The purging of the Church and the provision for the ministry, Jewel insisted, had been no haphazard affair, and he was sensitive to accusations that his Church had no form or order and permitted "every man to be a priest, to be a teacher, and to be an interpreter of the scriptures."<sup>1</sup> Those, he asserted, who made such charges "do us the greater wrong."<sup>2</sup> Assuming the ministry in the reformed Church was not an individual matter whereby any man was allowed to preach and teach on his own authority, but, according to Scriptural and primitive Church custom, it was an inward call of God which was outwardly recognized and executed by the rightful ecclesiastical and civil authority--the prince.

Though Jewel defended this practice of the Church of England as Scriptural, he did not declare that Churches which did not follow this particular practice were in error for not following what he believed to be Scriptural injunction. The Bishop's af-

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:320.

2. Ibid.

firmation rather reflected the official position of the Anglican Church as presented in the Twenty-third of the XXXIX Articles of Religion which stated that ministers ought to "be lawfully called and sent,"<sup>1</sup> without being more explicit.<sup>2</sup> Jewel, in his statements, indicated that in England the prince was the lawful organ by which this commission was accomplished; he was not defending the exclusive right of the prince to "call and send." He would readily concede that other Churches might have other means for establishing the ministry, for the exact way in which this calling and sending was carried out was secondary to the more important and Scriptural matter of an orderly ministry.

As well as being the means whereby the ministry was sent, it was a part of the sovereign's responsibility to care for the ministry of the Church by providing means, mainly financial, whereby men could be both called to, and cared for in, the holy office.

---

1. See Schaff, Creeds of Evangelical Protestant Churches: "Augsburg Confession," Article XIV, p. 15; "French Confession of Faith" (1559), Article XXXI, p. 377; "Belgic Confession" (1561), Article XXXI, p. 442; "First Helvetic Confession," Article XVI, p. 219.

2. See above, pp. 293-295.

Accusations that the Church of England had many men in her ministry who were ill prepared to assume the responsibilities of the office because of inadequate education were not entirely unfounded. Jewel knew that the success of the reformation of the Church depended almost entirely, humanly speaking, on properly educated and trained men who would enter upon this important work. Matters did not always progress as rapidly as many in the English Church, including the Bishop, desired, and it was generally agreed that this too-slow advance was caused, in large measure, by a lack of qualified ministers. Preaching before the Queen, Jewel took advantage of the occasion to point out that the visitation which she had ordered had revealed a poor state of affairs in the Church; he stated that the situation "standeth still in case as miserable as it did before."<sup>1</sup> Jewel believed that the dearth of trained clergy was responsible for this "miserable" condition and stated that if something was not done to provide sufficient livings for ministers, "the schools

---

1. Jewel, On Psalm 69:9, Works, II:1012. The exact date of this sermon is unknown, but the visitation referred to is probably the Royal Visitation of 1559.

will be forsake, the church desolate, the people wild and dismayed, the gospel discredited."<sup>1</sup> He called to Elizabeth's attention that already promising young men who might enter the service of the Church saw "that he which feedeth the flock hath least part of the milk," and consequently they "become weary and discouraged" and "change their studies: some become prentices, some turn to law: all shun and flee the ministry."<sup>2</sup> Unless this condition was remedied, the Bishop warned: "this noble realm which ever was famous for the name of learning, is like thereby to come to such ignorance and barbarity as hath not been heard of in any memory before our time."<sup>3</sup> As the Church's instrumentality to commission the ministry, Jewel called upon his Queen to

. . . behold the miserable disorder of God's church, so that you might foresee the calamities which will follow! It is a part of your kingdom, and such a part as is the principal prop and stay of the rest. I will say to your majesty as Cyrillus said to the godly emperors Theodosius and Valentinian: "The good estate and welfare of

1. Jewel, On Psalm 69:9, Works, II:1012.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid.; cf. Zwingli, Article LXIII of Zwingli's LXVIII Articles, in Selected Works of Huldreich Zwingli, p. 117.

your commonwealth hangeth upon true godliness." You are our governor, you are the nurse of God's church. We must open this grief before you . . . if it may be redressed, there is no other besides your highness that can redress it.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel was not merely content to affirm the doctrine of the supremacy of the prince over all people within the realm; he also made every effort to indicate the attendant responsibilities of sovereignty, especially in reference to the Church.

It is clear that Jewel entertained a high regard for the office of the ruler, particularly as the "Governor" of the Church. But what did he think of a prince who refused to attend to his responsibilities, and either ignored or attempted to destroy the Church of God in the land? What, according to the Bishop, should be the attitude of a subject toward a ruler who cared nothing for the ministry of God's Word and who did not do his duty and see to the religious and political welfare of his people? Even in such a situation, Jewel affirmed, subjects had a "duty to obey their princes and magistrates, yea, though they be

---

1. Jewel, *On Psalm 69:9*, *Works*, II:1014; cf. Philip Hughes, *The Reformation in England*, Vol. III, pp. 133-146.



wicked."<sup>1</sup> The only possibility open to one who had been commanded by his prince to renounce the Word was the patient suffering of whatever judgment the prince imposed. Citing a story referring to the Theban Legion in the third century, the Reformer illustrated his belief:

When they were called before kings, and princes . . . and commanded to forsake the truth . . . they answered in this manner: "O my gracious lord, I would fain do your commandment: I am your subject: I have done faithful service with my body, and with my goods: but I cannot serve you against God: he is King of kings, and Lord of lords: he is my Lord, before whom I stand: I have put my life in his hands. He hath forbidden me to do this thing which you command: I cannot therefore do it. Judge uprightly, whether it be meet to obey you rather than God. . . . God hath put his word in my mouth: I may not deny it. I may not bear false witness against the Lord. My life is not dear unto me in respect of the truth. . . . I owe you obedience; I will not resist your power; for, if I should resist, I should resist the ordinance of God."<sup>2</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:74.

2. Jewel, Treatise on the Holy Scripture, Works, IV:1172; see note no. 2, loc. cit. During Elizabeth's visit to Oxford in 1566, Jewel was moderator of a disputation, in the presence of the Queen, which considered the question: Whether a bad prince ought to be obeyed or not? Following a lively discussion in which Humphrey, Goodwin, and Calhhill took part, Jewel concluded "in a learned speech, in which he extolled the eloquence of the respondent, proved from the Scriptures and examples of the saints the obedience due to the royal power, expounding at full the behaviour of Paul towards Nero, and

The only weapons which a Christian could employ against a godless ruler were, in the words of St. Ambrose, "tears and prayers."<sup>1</sup>

## II. ROYAL SUPREMACY QUALIFIED

Jewel's concept of the Church centered in his conviction that God was Sovereign, and that His Church consisted of those whom He had called into the Body of Christ. The Bishop insisted, in opposition to the Roman doctrine of the pope as Vicar of Christ, that Christ alone was the Head of His Body and needed no man to rule in His place. How then could the Reformer, on the one hand so vigorously advocate the absolute lordship of Jesus Christ over the Church, and yet on the other hand defend with equal zeal the headship of the temporal prince over the Church of England? How was it possible for him to reconcile the Church as a society of men under God, owing primary allegiance to Him, with her ultimate control by the secular government?

---

of David to Saul." Dixon, History of the Church of England, Vol. VI, p. 142. See Neill, The Ministry of the Church, p. 27.

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:170-171; Ambrosius, Sermone contra auxentum, 1, "De Basilicis Tradendis," in Opera Omnia, Vol. II, Col. 1008.

In order to answer these questions it is necessary to bear in mind that Jewel was first an ecclesiastic whose chief concern was with the reformation of the English Church and the advancement of the Protestant cause in England. He knew, in the words of an Anglican divine of a later time, that the future of the Church and State were identical and "the fall of one drew with it the fall of the other."<sup>1</sup> There were, he recognized, dangers in each alternative which faced the Church. If, and this was advocated by only the extreme Anabaptists and other radicals, the Church was completely independent from the State, the divisions which would result would be intolerable and destroy the cause of truth and unity in England and make the Church vulnerable to Roman attacks. If the Church should become the dominant party, which was unthinkable from the political point of view, there would be a retreat to the situation which existed in the realm before the time of Henry VIII. There was therefore only one possible solution: the subjection of the Church to the Crown.<sup>2</sup> This was the most desirable

1. H. H. Benson, The Relation of the Church of England to other Reformation Churches, p. 15.

2. See James A. Williamson, The Tudor Age (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1957), pp. 249-254.

solution in practically all quarters. The ideals of the Reformation had made great strides since Henry's break with Rome, and there was every indication that Elizabeth would restore and continue the reforms undertaken during the reign of Edward VI. Though the Queen was cautious at first, there was little doubt that she realized her best interests lay with the Protestant cause. Jewel cast his lot with those of the "via media" who were resolved to support the Queen and the royal supremacy in spite of occasionally disagreeing with her sometimes too-conservative ecclesiastical policies, for it was only with her aid that the cause of truth and reform could prevail. Jewel was willing to support a seemingly extreme erastianism in order to defend a prince who in turn furthered that which was closest to his heart--the reformation of the Church of England.

Notwithstanding this attitude, it must not be thought that Jewel gave his unconditional support to the erastian nature of the Elizabethan Settlement. Even a cursory reading of his works will reveal, consistent with his belief regarding the nature of the Church, definite reservations about the absolute authority of the State in matters ecclesiastical. We now

turn to a consideration of these qualifications.

#### A. THE PRINCE AS SUPREME GOVERNOR

The fact that Elizabeth had refused the title of "Supreme Head of the Church of England" was important to Jewel's understanding of the Royal Supremacy, for it expressed, to him, the true nature of the Queen's authority over the Church.<sup>1</sup> Harding, the Bishop affirmed, was wrong in believing that the Queen was the "Head" of the Church, for this was a title which had not been devised by the Church of England at all, but on the contrary, according to the Reformer it had been forced on Henry by his Roman Catholic counselors desiring to bring him into disrepute;<sup>2</sup> consequently he concluded: "No use it not (and) . . . our princes at this present claim it not."<sup>3</sup> Jewel would have it known that the sovereign of England claimed the title of "Governor" of the Church, not the "Head,"

1. Jewel, A View of A Seditious Bull, Works, IV:1144.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:974: "Your fathers, M. Harding, first intituled that most noble and most worthy prince, king Henry . . . with that unused and strange style, as it may well be thought, the rather to bring him into the talk and slander of the world." Cf. Zurich Letters, I, pp. 24, 29, 33.

3. Jewel, loc. cit.



because this latter title was applicable only to Christ, while the former described a right which had "been invested and planted in them (princes) from the beginning."<sup>1</sup> He then discussed the way in which Elizabeth governed the Church.

Jewel's explanation began on a negative note because he first had to answer the Roman Catholic allegations presented by Harding that the Church of England confounded "the offices of the spiritual governors and temporal magistrates,"<sup>2</sup> and that "temporal princes" took "upon them the office of the pope and bishop."<sup>3</sup> Harding's position was officially expressed in the Bull of Pius V (1570), excommunicating Elizabeth, in which it was declared:

Radem, occupato regno, supremi ecclesiae capitis locum in omni Anglia, ejusque praecipuam auctoritatem atque jurisdictionem monstrose sibi usurpans, regnum ipsum rursus in miserum exitium revocavit.<sup>4</sup>

Jewel responded by stating that the Roman Church was

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:974. See Meale, Queen Elizabeth I, pp. 60-61.

2. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:958.

3. Ibid., IV:970.

4. Latin text of the Bull is in Works, IV:1131-1132.

totally wrong in making those accusations. He declared that it was not the prerogative of the Queen to take upon herself the peculiar work of the ordained clergy,, that "we confound not these offices," that "our priests never took upon them the office of a bishop;" on the contrary, the Roman "bishops have taken upon them the office of the prince,"<sup>1</sup> The Apologist explained the Anglican position:

We say both the prince and the bishop have charge of the church, yet the prince and the bishop have not both one kind of charge. The bishop's charge is to preach, to minister sacraments, to order priests, to excommunicate, to absolve, etc. The prince's charge is not to do any of those things himself, in his own person, but only to see that they be done, and orderly and truly done, by the bishops.<sup>2</sup>

Answering specifically the Roman charges in the Bull of excommunication, he stated that Elizabeth

. . . preacheth not, she ministereth not the sacraments, she doth neither excommunicate nor absolve from excommunication, she sitteth not to give sentence in spiritual causes, she chal-  
lengeth not the dispensation of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. She doth nothing but what she may lawfully do, nothing but whereunto the Lord God hath given her especial warrant. Her majesty is supreme governor over her subjects.

1. Jowet, Defence, Works, IV:971.

2. Ibid., IV:959; cf. IV:958.

The bishops within her realm are subjects to her. She governeth; they yield obedience. When occasion is offered to dispose of anything specially appertaining to the service of God, or to judge of any controversy arising in spiritual causes; she commendeth and giveth to her learned divines the due consideration thereof: all other pleas and suits she causeth to be ended at home, and suffereth no appeals to fly to Rome.<sup>1</sup>

According to Jewel's interpretation of the Anglican doctrine of the Supremacy, the prince, as head of a particular unified society, was responsible for the well ordering of that society in all its aspects. The ruler, as a member of that society, along with every "private man," was bound to keep both tables of the Divine law, but in addition, the prince had been exclusively called of God "to see that all others his subjects, as well priests as laymen, each man in his calling, do duly keep them."<sup>2</sup> As a result of this vocation to maintain the well being of the whole commonwealth, spiritual as well as temporal, the prince bore rule over the clergy: "We say not that the prince is bound to do the bishop's duty . . . the prince is bound to see the bishops do their duties."<sup>3</sup> Jewel

---

1. Jewel, A View of a Seditious Bull, Works, IV:1145.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:976.

3. Ibid.; of, IV:959.

found justification for this view in the Scriptures:

God by his prophets often and earnestly commanded the king to cut down the groves, to break down the images and alters of idols, and to write out the book of the law for himself. . . . We see by histories and by examples of the best times, that good princes ever took the administration of ecclesiastical matters to pertain to their duty.<sup>1</sup>

All estates of the realm, Jewel contended, were under the authority of the prince, whose duty it was to see that the commonwealth functioned orderly, efficiently, and in the interests of justice and truth.

Although the prince might not take upon himself the duties of the ministry, but rather governed and saw to it that the clergy fulfilled their responsibilities, the Royal Supremacy implied that the sovereign could determine what that duty was, a determination which often involved theological matters. E. T. Davis suggests that though Henry VIII never assumed to take upon himself the duties of the priest, this did not prevent him from determining the doctrinal basis for clerical actions.<sup>2</sup> Jewel expressed agreement with this feature

---

1. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:98.

2. E. T. Davis, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950), pp. 72-73; cf. Southgate, John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 207.

of royal policy. I Corinthians 14 was interpreted by the Reformer to refer to the rule of princes in the Church, for he said: "Here we see it is lawful for a godly prince . . . to make laws and orders for the church; to redress the abuses of the sacraments; to allegorize the scriptures."<sup>1</sup> Jewel identified the following position taken by the emperor Justinian, cited by Balsamon, a Greek canonist of the twelfth century, with that of the Church of England:

The patriarch is bound to make his answer before the emperor, and of him to receive correction . . . The patriarch shall be judged of the emperor, having the knowledge of the ecclesiastical power, whether the matter be of sacrilege, or of heresy, or of any other crime. For this have we seen done oftentimes in form of judgment.<sup>2</sup>

It was implicit in Jewel's concept of the Royal Supremacy that the prince had the authority to determine ecclesiastical laws, the right to judge such doctrinal matters as whether or not the Sacraments were being abused, and the right to decide what constituted heresy. However, since Elizabeth, in as far as possible, followed a policy of non-intervention in ecclesiastical matters, we have no indication of how, or if, Jewel would have

1. Jewel, Reply, Works, I:287.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:967; Theodore Balsamon in Synod. Ant., Canon XII, in Canones S.S. Apostolorum Conciliorum (Lutetiae: 1620), p. 821.



defended his Queen had she decided some doctrinal matter in a way the Bishop believed was contrary to the teaching of the Scriptures. Because his sovereign fulfilled Jewel's requirement for a "godly prince," or what is more likely, because he was able to speak of a "godly prince" by describing Elizabeth's relation to the Church and Nation, he was able to support her and her policies.

A closer examination of Jewel's views reveals both his practical reasons for holding the doctrine of the Royal Supremacy and the conditions under which they were modified. The prince had the right, as ruler of his realm, to exercise his authority and maintain order over all men, yet this did not mean that his knowledge in all areas was complete or infallible. Speaking of the Roman subjection of the State to the Church, Jewel affirmed: "It is a great arrogancy to advance a bishop above a king," but immediately added the qualification: "Notwithstanding in some good meaning it may be true."<sup>1</sup> This superiority of a bishop over a secular ruler was one of knowledge rather than of position: of degree rather than of character, for, he said: "Touching the knowledge of God's word and cases

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:674.

of religion, certain it is the king is inferior to a bishop."<sup>1</sup> He illustrated his point:

So a judge, in knowledge of the law; so a doctor of physic, in his profession; so a pilot, in knowledge of the sea, and guiding of a ship; so a captain, in martial affairs, is above any king; and it behoveth a king, be he never so wise or mighty, in every of these several faculties to be guided by them. And thus is the king inferior, not only to a bishop, as you say, but also to every inferior priest.<sup>2</sup>

As a wise king should welcome the advice of a physician on matters of health, and the counsel of military leaders on affairs of war, so he should follow the guidance of men of religion on matters of the faith. It is significant that the Apologist said nothing about the clergy possessing powers not held by the civil ruler, or that it was required of the prince, in matters of religion, to accede to a bishop.

END OF THE SECOND PART

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:675. Southgate states: "The very nature of the area of priestly knowledge, in contrast to that of the others, indicates a difference in kind rather than degree." John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority, p. 208. This judgment is opposed to Jewel's conviction that Christian knowledge is open to all; it was not a matter therefore of a difference in "kind" but merely the practical result of the clergy being in a position to devote more time to the Scriptures, and consequently to acquire more knowledge in "degree."

2. Jewel, op. cit., IV:674.

Jewel's concept of the absolute, objective authority of the Word of God caused him to draw a distinction between the sovereign as king and the sovereign as a subject under God. Harding had complained that Luther affirmed: "Among christian men none can nor ought to be a magistrate, but each one is to the other equally subject."<sup>1</sup> To this the Bishop replied:

Luther speaketh not these words of the outward civil government, whereof only we speak now, but only of our inward band and obedience towards. And in this respect there is no king nor prince indeed, nor may be any . . . In civil government a king is a king; and so hath God commanded him to be known: but after that we be once come to the reverence and obedience of God's will, there God only is the king; and the king, be he never so mighty, is but a subject.<sup>2</sup>

In the Church, the society of the faithful, the Reformer believed there was no king but Christ, and the ultimate authority was the Word of God. In this society the leadership was invested in those who because of a superior of God's Word could interpret it, and hence, in this sense, the prince was inferior to a priest.

"The prince," Jewel asserted, "is bound to the obedience of God's word no less than if he were a private citizen."<sup>3</sup>

---

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:669.

2. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:670; see IV:669, note no. 14.

3. Ibid., IV:674.

This implied superiority of the clergy in matters of religion was nowhere mentioned in any definition or expression of Royal Supremacy, and Jewel's idealistic concept of the cooperation between the sovereign and the prelates of the Church was unsupported by any official statement. Indeed, many Anglican clergy would have conceded that the sovereign's rights in the Church were well nigh unconditional.<sup>1</sup> Happily, Elizabeth did

---

1. For example, in a letter to Burghley, probably written in 1573, Archbishop Parker stated: "Sir, because you be a principal councillor I refer the whole matter (of the ordering of the Church) to her Majesty and to your order; for myself I can as well be content to be a parish-clerk as a parish-priest. I refer the standing or falling altogether to your own considerations, whether her Majesty and you will have any archbishops or bishops, or how you will have them ordered." Parker Correspondence, p. 454, parenthesis mine. Barlow, one of Parker's consecrators, declared: "If the King's Grace, being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman (being learned) to be a bishop, that he so chosen (without mention being made of any orders) should be as good a bishop as he is, or the best in England." Quoted in John Brown, Apostolic Succession (London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1898), p. 382. Parentheses are Barlow's. Archbishop Whitgift, speaking on the same subject of the place of bishops in the Church, said: "If it had pleased her majesty, with the wisdom of the realm, to have used no bishops at all, we could not have complained justly of any defect in our Church. Or if it had liked them to have limited the authority of bishops to shorter terms, they might not have said, they had any wrong. But sith it hath pleased her majesty to use the ministry of bishops, and to assign them this authority, it must be to me, that am a subject, as God's ordinance, and therefore to be obeyed according to St Paul his rule. If it were demanded by what warrant



nothing to cause Jewel to retreat from this position, and once again he could point with pride to the situation which existed in England--the Queen as the living embodiment of that Biblical doctrine of the supremacy of the godly prince.

### B. THE REFORMATION IN SCOTLAND

Though the near-ideal state of affairs in England

---

they (the reverend fathers of our church) only do impose hands; or why they, with the arch-deacons and a few others have peculiar jurisdiction, as it is termed, do execute the church censures; they would say, they had for it the laws and policy of this realm. Whereto, forasmuch as her majesty giveth life, they must consequently maintain, they do it by her majesty's authority; and so derive it from God; because she is the Lord's immediate minister with us. For, if it had pleased her majesty to have assigned the imposition of hands to the deans of every cathedral church, or some other number of ministers which in no sort were bishops, but as they be pastors, there had been no wrong done to their persons, that I can conceive." Strype, Annals, Vol. I, part 2, pp. 222-223. Parenthesis is Whitgift's. Cf. Powicke, The Reformation in England, p. 127. Archbishop Whitgift was also quoted as having said: "The continual practice of Christian Churches, in the time of Christian magistrates, before the usurpation of the Bishop of Rome, hath been given to Christian princes supreme authority in making ecclesiastical orders and laws, yea and that which is more, in deciding of matters of religion, even in the chief and principal points." J. W. Allen, A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1961), 174.



did not give the Bishop opportunity to reveal his attitude toward the relation between the Church and a sovereign who, in his estimation, did not rule under the Word of God, and did not seek the advice of those with a superior knowledge of the Scriptures, the plight of the Scottish Queen Mary did. Jewel was reasonably well informed on affairs north of the border and frequently referred to them in his letters to friends on the Continent, always speaking with approval of what was happening to the Roman faith in Scotland which was supported by Mary.<sup>1</sup> He reported to Peter Martyr in 1559:

The nobility with united hearts and hands are restoring religion throughout the country, in spite of all opposition. All the monasteries are everywhere levelled with the ground; the theatrical dresses, the sacrilegious chalices, the idols, the altars, are consigned to the flames; not a vestige of the ancient superstition and idolatry is left . . . You have often heard of "drinking like a Scythian;" but this is "churching it like a Scythian."<sup>2</sup>

Three months later, on November 2nd, he again reported: "The gospel is taught; churches are diligently brought together, and all the monuments of the old superstition

---

1. For the most probably sources of Jewel's information about Scottish affairs, see Robinson's conclusions in Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 56-57, notes 1-10.

2. Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 39-40.

demolished."<sup>1</sup> Commenting to Bullinger, in a letter dated August 7th, 1570, on affairs in Scotland, Jewel observed that there were two distinct parties in existence there: one supporting Mary and "popery," the followers of the other party, he said, "cherish the pure religion and the gospel, and adhere to us."<sup>2</sup> The Apologist recognized the close relationship between the Reformation in England and her northern neighbor, and identified the cause of the one with the other.

This change of religion in Scotland, encouraged by the Church of England, as both Harding and Jewel knew, had been accomplished contrary to the avowed will of the prince. The Bishop was on the defensive. "Hath the queen of Scotland," Harding asked, "cause to praise the proceedings of your gospel, through occasion whereof she ruleth not her subjects, but is ruled by them?"<sup>3</sup> Harding felt himself completely justified, in view of Protestant efforts in Scotland, in asking: "Can monarchs and princes seem to be maintained by your sects, who teach people to rebel for protensed religion?"<sup>4</sup>

1. Zurich Letters, Vol. I, p. 46.

2. Jewel, Works, IV:1279

3. Harding, Confutation, Works, III:170. 4. Ibid.

Jewel was in the uncomfortable position of having to defend his fellow Protestants only a few hundred miles away for actions he condemned in his own land.

The Reformer first indicated to his opponents that the conflict in Scotland was political in nature and that the nobles were defending the nation against foreign invasion instigated by the Roman Catholics.<sup>1</sup> Yet when the Scots found themselves in opposition to their Queen, Jewel declared,

. . . they withdrew themselves with their power into the marches of England, not for want of strength or courage, . . . but only for reverence of their prince, that came upon them; lest they should be forced, by rage of their enemies and fury of war, to strike the anointed of the Lord.<sup>2</sup>

But even before the time of writing this defence, the Reformer knew this was an untenable position,<sup>3</sup> and later, upon learning of Barnley's murder in Edinburgh<sup>4</sup> by the supposed hand of Mary's lover, and with her knowledge and approval, he was compelled to reveal his true position regarding the relation between the Church and a wicked ruler.<sup>5</sup>

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:172. 2. Ibid., III:173.

3. Jewel to Martyr, December 1st, 1559, in Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 59-60.

4. February 9th, 1567.

5. See Jewel to Bullinger, August 7th, 1570, Works, IV:1279.

Jewel looked upon the actions of the Scottish nobles and people as fundamentally a political act, but also believed them to have religious significance since God had used the rebellion as a judgment against a godless ruler:

Surely God hath not suffered such great faults to escape unpunished even in princes, as doth well appear by the examples of queen Jasabel in Israel, queen Johanne in Naples, king Tarquin in Rome, whom for their great wickedness God, by stirring their own subjects against them, deprived them of their princely estates. For princes also are God's subjects, against whom, for their offences against his majesty, he proceedeth as well as against the basest sorts of men, by such ways as to his heavenly wisdom it seemeth good.<sup>1</sup>

Though Jewel could affirm that any unbaptized and unfaithful ruler was still a minister of God,<sup>2</sup> when it came to an actual application of his theory of non-resistance which required the surrender of the freedom of the Word of God, he came out on the side of disobedience to defend truth. "The subject," he stated, "is bound to obey his prince; howbeit not in all things without exception, so far as God's glory is not touched."<sup>3</sup> The nobles of Scotland had learned of St. Peter: "It is better to obey God than man," and from the prophet

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:174.

2. Ibid., IV:1009.      3. Ibid., III:173.

David: "Better it is to trust to God than to trust in princes. For they are mortal, and shall die: their spirit shall be taken from them; and then shall they return to the earth."<sup>1</sup> It was only an ungodly prince who would rather see himself obeyed than God; a godly prince would not "take it as any dishonour to his estate to see God obeyed before him"<sup>2</sup> Jewel admitted that the Scottish nobles had been in the field against their ruler, but, he declared, so "was David in the field against king Saul."<sup>3</sup> If, as Harding had indicated, it was "lawful for subjects to draw the sword in defence of the pope, why," the Reformer asked, "may you not also think it is lawful for them to defend themselves in defence of Christ?"<sup>4</sup>

Two basic points in Jewel's position are to be noted.

First, the Apologist made a distinction between active and passive resistance on behalf of a private subject to a godless prince. The subject, Jewel believed,

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:173; Acts 5:29; Psalm 110:9, 146:4.

2. Jewel, loc. cit. 3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., III:172.



was required to obey his prince, but only if in so doing he did not act in any way, or believe anything, contrary to God's truth as revealed in the Scriptures. If the subject was placed in a position wherein he was required to choose between the commands of his prince and the commands of his God, he was obliged to obey God, but only to the extent of refusing to obey his sovereign; he had no right to seek to overthrow him by overt action.

Secondly, Jewel's position on the place of rebellion reflected his respect for the God-ordained civil authority. In condoning the rebellion in Scotland, which is the only example of a practical application of his attitude toward a wicked prince, Jewel was careful to observe that it had not been undertaken by any private authority, but was under the leadership of the Scottish "nobles." His illustration of David "in the field against king Saul" was an example of the Lord's anointed seeking to rectify conditions brought about by, what for Jewel's purposes was, a godless prince; it was not one of a private subject revolting against the God-ordained authority. Nothing Jewel said can be construed as indicating he

would support a popular insurrection against authority; his words rather indicate that he supported the rebellion of godly men in positions of authority (lords, nobles, magistrates, etc.) against a godless ruler. For him it was not a case of yielding obedience to the highest of the divinely ordained powers, but, if the highest power suppressed the Gospel and persecuted Christ's Church, then temporal lords were to be obeyed for they were equally God-ordained and they supported truth against error. Therefore, even in defending the Scottish rebellion against Mary, Jewel was not denying his professed belief that private citizens must be subject to the higher authority.

Jewel, instead of presenting two diametrically opposed views of a Christian's attitude toward his sovereign as a superficial examination of his views might indicate, applied the doctrine of obedience under two different circumstances. If the ruler suppressed the Gospel, then the reformer was prepared to support more than passive resistance when led by other duly constituted civil authority; if the prince fostered the true Christian faith, then subjects were to be obedient in all things. He was able to hold this position since he was convinced that the faith of the

Church of England was the true faith of Christ, and because his concept of the cooperation that ought to exist between prince and bishop, Church and State, worked so well within the realm, he was willing to give his whole-hearted support to the supremacy of the Crown. His main purpose was to maintain the gains of the Reformation and the integrity of the Anglican Church, and he found that the best way to accomplish this in England was to guard the Queen's rights and to urge others to do the same. In Scotland the rebellion which Jewel defended had been in the interests of truth and the Gospel, led by legitimate authority against a godless ruler who had defied God's laws and suppressed the Scripture.

#### C. THE AUTHORITY OF PARLIAMENT

The practical nature of the solution of the religious problem which was acceptable to Jewel is also illustrated in his attitude toward Parliament. Harding had accused the Anglican Church of having a "parliament-religion, parliament-gospel," and a "parliament faith."<sup>1</sup> It is easy to see how he might arrive

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:903.

1. Harding, Confutation, Works, IV:903.

at such a conclusion. Parliament had changed the religion of England from Roman Catholic to that of the Reformation; it acknowledged Henry VIII as "Head," and later Elizabeth as "Governor" of the Church; it had established the Prayer Book and Ordinal, and had passed numerous acts bearing on religion within the realm. It seemed that the Church of England was entirely dependant on both queen and parliament for her existence and for her validity, and that therefore Harding's observations were not unjust or inaccurate.

But Jewel never gave parliament place or authority over the Church as alleged by his opponent. The Bishop readily acknowledged that great reforms had been accomplished through parliament, but he refused to concede that the Anglican Church depended on parliament or on any other human agency or individual for her authenticity. "We will not," he said, "discuss the right and interest of parliaments of England. As much as concerneth God's everlasting truth, we hold not by parliament, but by God."<sup>1</sup> No doubt with the recent parliamentary decisions under Queen Mary in mind he continued: "Parliaments are uncertain, and often con-

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:903.

trary, as we have seen; but God's truth is one, and certain, and never changeth."<sup>1</sup>

The Reformer's only appeal to the authority of parliament was to indicate that the reformation of the English Church had been accomplished legally and with the consent of the proper authorities.<sup>2</sup> Anticipating a question regarding the execution of the English Reformation without recourse to a general council, Jewel declared: "We do not despise councils, assemblies, and conferences of bishops and learned men; neither have we done that we have done altogether without bishops or without a council. The matter hath been treated in open parliament, with long consultation, and before a notable synod and convocation."<sup>3</sup> He informed Henry Cole that the doctrine of the Anglican Church which had been called into question by the Roman Church was "grounded upon God's word, and authorized and set forth by the queen's majesty, and by the assent of the whole realm,"<sup>4</sup>

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:903.

2. See above, pp. 231-234.

3. Jewel, Apology, Works, III:93.

4. Jewel, Answer to Dr. Cole's Second Letter, Works, I:31; cf. Reply to Dr. Cole, Works, I:44, Reply, Works, II:628-629.



but he never suggested that the Church of England received her warrant from any but God alone.<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's statements concerning the objective nature of Christian truth, and a citizen's first allegiance to God, left no doubt as to the place of the place of the queen, parliament, and legal authority over ecclesiastical matters in his own mind. Practically speaking, it was an expedient, as well as a generally satisfactory, answer to the all-important question of how to further the Protestant principles of the Reformation in England, while theologically he believed the sovereign and parliament merely to be the agents whereby the true religion was legally established and the Protestant faith acknowledged to be that of the nation. It would be a logical assumption that had Parliament or the Queen acted contrary to the truth, and had leadership from duly constituted authority been available, Jewel would have advocated the same policy toward this ungodly authority as he did toward an ungodly prince as exemplified in Mary of Scotland. But because his Queen and her government worked for the

---

1. Cf. above, pp. 391-400.

advance of the cause of Christ, the Reformer accepted the authority of the civil over the ecclesiastical as a utilitarian solution to the existing problem.

### III. JEWEL AND CALVIN ON THE CHURCH AND STATE

The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England was unique among the reformed Churches of the sixteenth century, and to many minds it was the most radical, especially as it was championed by several of the Tudor ecclesiastics.<sup>1</sup> The general acceptance of this Settlement, as has been noted, was largely the result of a willing compromise on the part of the Church in offering obedience to a government friendly to her, if only for the government's selfish purposes of fostering national unity wherever possible. But the question may be asked: Was this settlement as interpreted by Jewel as radical and revolutionary, even among the Protestant Churches of that day, as some believe? Is Philip Hughes correct in declaring that in Harding's criticism of the relationship which existed in England between the Church and the prince, he

. . . had with him, not only all the Catholicism both of his own century and of all antiquity, but

1. See above, p. 451, note no. 1.

all the varied theological production of his own century too--except Jewel and those who, in this new Church agreed with Jewel. Lutherans, Zwinglians, Calvinists, no less than Anabaptists, Brownists, Separatists--and many even of Jewel's own following, sealed with the Elizabethan election in its fulness--reject and abhorred the novelty quite as openly, and as vehemently, as did the Catholic writers of Louvain.<sup>1</sup>

In seeking an answer to this question, a brief review of Jewel's major assertions regarding the Church and the civil government will be undertaken in concluding this chapter, and in order to highlight them, a comparison will be made with the views of Calvin on this important subject.

Jewel first of all shared with Calvin an extremely high regard for the civil authority and those who exercised it--whether it was a local town magistrate or the ruler of a nation. The Bishop's belief that the civil government was ordained of God was closely paralleled in Calvin's thought. The Genevan Reformer too believed that all authority had its origin in God, and all holders of temporal office had been called thereto by God, and thereby fulfilled a holy vocation:

The Lord has not only testified that the office of magistrate is approved by and acceptable to him,

---

1. P. Hughes, The Reformation in England, Vol. III, p. 76.

but he also sets out its dignity with the most honorable titles and marvelously commends it to us. . . . No one ought to doubt that civil authority is a calling, not only holy and lawful before God, but also the most sacred and by far the most honorable of all callings in the whole life of mortal men.<sup>1</sup>

Calvin, with Jewel, scorned those leaders of nations who were only concerned with the pursuit of civil justice without regard for the souls of those committed to their charge. Those princes, Jewel declared,

. . . do most grievously offend, who sit at ease, follow their pleasures, and patiently suffer impious rites and contempt of God, leaving all unto the bishops, . . . as if the care of the Church and of God's people belonged not to them, or as if they were pastors but of sheep and oxen, as it were, and had care of their bodies, and not also of their souls. They remember not they are God's servants, chosen of purpose to serve him<sup>2</sup>

In like manner Calvin affirmed that the civil government had not only the duty to see to it "that men breathe, eat, drink, and are kept warm, . . . but also" it was called upon to prevent

. . . idolatry, sacrilege against God's name, blasphemies against his truth, and other public offences against religion from arising and spreading among the people . . . In short, (it is provided) that a public manifestation of religion

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xx:4.

2. Jewel, Epistle to Scipio, Works, IV:1126.

may exist among Christians, and that humanity be maintained among men.<sup>1</sup>

It was only the foolish, Calvin maintained, "who would neglect the concern for God and would give attention only to rendering justice among men."<sup>2</sup>

Neither was Calvin surpassed by Jewel in the matter of the obedience which was due a prince, either godly or wicked, by his subjects. The high regard for the civil power which the two Reformers held in common naturally led to remarkably similar views on the necessary submission to the civil authorities. "The first duty of subjects," Calvin asserted,

toward their magistrates is to think most honorably of their office, which they recognize as a jurisdiction bestowed by God, and on that account to esteem and reverence them as ministers and representatives of God. . . . They are showing obedience to God himself when they give it to them; since the ruler's power is from God.<sup>3</sup>

Even "the most worthless kings are appointed by the same decree by which the authority of all kings is established" and they should be obeyed in spite of their lack of merit because, Calvin added, "it is unfair

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xx:3.

2. Ibid., IV:xx:9.

3. Ibid., IV:xx:22.



that we should show ourselves subjects to him, who, on his part, does not show himself a king to us."<sup>1</sup> Nor did Calvin, like Jewel, neglect to urge submission to wicked princes. Citing the anti-Christian rulers of the first century, Calvin observed that Paul had urged both submission to, and prayers for, such rulers. Just because of "the depravity of men" there was, he declared, no "reason why God's ordinance should not be loved." Returning to his original promise Calvin stated:

Accordingly, seeing that God appointed magistrates and princes for the preservation of mankind, however much they fall short of the divine appointment, still we must not on that account cease to love what belongs to God, and to desire that it may remain in force. That is the reason why believers, in whatever country they live, must not only obey the laws and the government of magistrates, but likewise in their prayers supplicate God for their salvation . . . The universal doctrine is this, that we should desire the continuance and peaceful condition of those governments which have been appointed by God.<sup>2</sup>

Calvin was a firm adherent to the principle that subjects ought to obey their prince in temporal matters, but as with Jewel, when it came to a spiritual situation wherein obeying the prince would involve disobedience to an ordinance of God, Calvin modified

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xx:27.

2. Calvin, Commentary on Timothy, translated for the Calvin Translation Society by Wm. Fringlo (Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1856), p. 51.

his position:

But in that obedience which we have shown to be due the authority of rulers, we are always to make this exception, indeed, to observe it as primary, that such obedience is never to lead us away from obedience to him, to whose will the desires of all kings ought to be subject, to whose decrees all their commands ought to yield, to whose majesty their scepters ought to be submitted. . . . If they command anything against him, let it go unesteemed . . . . Let us comfort ourselves with the thought that we are rendering that obedience which the Lord requires when we suffer anything rather than turn aside from piety.<sup>1</sup>

Calvin too underscored his position by attesting Acts 5:29: "We must obey God rather than men."<sup>2</sup>

The belief held by Jewel that subjects were not required to obey an ungodly sovereign in things spiritual when contrary to the Word of God, as has been noted, led the Apologist one step further--to condone rebellion against a prince under certain circumstances, especially, as in Scotland, where the ruler was hindering the Word. This particular revolt, as Jewel observed, was led by the nobles of the nation and had not been undertaken on private authority.<sup>3</sup> Again Calvin was in close agreement. As Jewel had

---

1. Calvin, Institutes, IV:xx:32.

2. Ibid.

3. Jewel, Defence, Works, III:172-173.

pointed out that God would not permit a wicked ruler to go unpunished, again in the particular instance of Mary of Scotland, Calvin affirmed that though the perpetrators of a rebellion did an "evil act," they were used of God "to punish the wicked government and deliver his people."<sup>1</sup> It was the duty of magistrates to "restrain the willfulness of kings," and, Calvin asserted,

. . . I am so far from forbidding them to withstand, in accordance with their duty, the fierce licentiousness of kings, that, if they wink at kings who violently fall upon and assault the lowly common folk, I declare that their dissimulation involves nefarious perfidy, because they dishonestly betray the freedom of the people, of which they know that they have been appointed protectors by God's ordinance.<sup>2</sup>

It is plain that though the official settlement under Elizabeth was thoroughly Erastian, Jewel's interpretation of it was unashamedly "Calvinistic." It is equally evident that in all major features he was in agreement with the Genevan Reformer. It is ironic that Jewel enjoyed more religious freedom in a Church which was almost completely subject to the State than did Calvin, who, although serving in a situation more democratic than in England, experienced uncounted

1. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV:xx:30.

2. *Ibid.*, IV:xx:31; see *Institutes*, Vol. II (Library of Christian Classics), p. 1518, note no. 54.

difficulties with the civil authorities. It was Jewel's devotion to the supreme authority of the Scriptures which kept him from a thorough-going theory of Arastrianism, and not as E. T. Davis states, when speaking generally of the attitude of the sixteenth-century English divines toward Royal Supremacy, an "emphasis on episcopal authority in the church."<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's agreement with Calvin on the matter of obedience and rebellion was more a matter of necessity and meeting the needs of a particular situation than it was a well thought out policy based on a systematic theology. His conservative English nature led him one step at a time, and if the Apology had been his only work, later generations would have had no choice but to include him with the extreme Arastrians of his age. As it was, Harding forced him to declare himself on Protestant activities in Scotland, which Jewel did in his Defence without reluctance, but yet without enthusiasm and without elaborating his position or taking it, as Knox had done,<sup>2</sup> to its logical conclusions.

---

1. E. T. Davis, Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century, p. 99.

2. Jewel joined Calvin in denouncing Knox's "First blast against the monstrous regiment and empire of women"

He was content to meet situations as they arose and to respond as the situation demanded.

Hughes, in seeking an example of an extreme Erastian would have been more correct had he cited the official statements of the Settlement under the Tudors, for to cite Jewel as the leading exponent of an Erastian solution is to misinterpret him completely.

---

(c. 1556), aimed particularly at Mary Tudor and Mary of Lorraine, but equally applicable to the "godly prince" Elizabeth. See letter of Calvin to Wm. Cecil, c. January 29th, 1559, in Zurich Letters, Vol. I, pp. 34-36; Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:665. Jewel's and Calvin's position on the right of duly constituted authorities to rebel, in the interests of the people and the Gospel, against a wicked prince have much in common with Knox's position, but never having been faced with a godless prince as the Scot was, they were not as radical, nor from what we know of their views would they have gone to the same extremes. See John Knox, The Appellation of John Knox (1558), in The Works of John Knox, collected and edited by David Laing, Vol. IV, pp. 465-520.



## CHAPTER XII

### CONCLUSION

Leonard Hodgson states that "the Anglican child is taught that to the question, 'Where was the Church of England before the Reformation?' the correct reply is the counter-question, 'Where was your face before you washed it?'"<sup>1</sup> It was the thought expressed in this counter-question that underlay Jewel's polemic with the Church of Rome. He, nor any other major Reformer, had no idea that in expounding any aspect of the Protestant position he was presenting any new doctrine or advocating any practice which had never been fully accepted by the ancient Church. When Jewel spoke of the "new religion"<sup>2</sup> of the Church of England he meant that it was new in reference to the innovations of the Roman Church; he did not mean that it was an entirely new faith. On the contrary, all of Jewel's

---

1. Leonard Hodgson, "The Church of England," in The Nature of the Church, Nelson Flow, editor, p. 121.

2. Jewel, Sermon on Romans 12:16-18, Works, II:1091.

efforts as apologist, theologian, and historian were expended toward demonstrating that the Church of England, and her sister reformed Churches, had returned to the pure faith, customs, and doctrines of the Apostolic Church. The very concept of anything "new" in religion was repellent to Jewel since it was his declared purpose to return "to the church of the apostles and of the old catholic bishops and fathers."<sup>1</sup>

Jewel's doctrine of the Church therefore contained nothing unique, and, in the sense of new insights or concepts, contributed nothing to a fuller understanding of the Church. He said nothing about the Church which had not been said before by the early fathers, by spiritual men throughout her history, and in more recent days by the great Reformers. His training at the hands of Protestant divines while in Oxford and his close contact with Peter Martyr, Henry Bullinger, and other European Reformed theologians during his self-imposed exile, together with the anti-Roman attitude and desire to return to the simplicity and purity of apostolic Christianity shared by all Protestants, caused his fundamental doctrinal position

---

1. Jewel, Defence, Works, IV:1042.

on the Church to be identical with that of the leading Reformers in other countries.

It is at this point the significance and value of Jewel's contribution begins to be evident. In defending the Church of England on the same basis as the great Reformers on the Continent defended their Churches, Jewel expressed the Church of England's fraternal feeling toward, and unity with, these major Protestant bodies. He recognized that the basic Christian doctrines held in common by these Churches constituted the essential requirements for a Church of Christ, though their application, necessitated by differences in local situations, might not be uniform.

Jewel's doctrine reflected, as well, a characteristic attitude of the Elizabethan Church. Whereas in later years, not without some justification, her attitude was described as "superior" and "exclusive," in the sixteenth century it was "nationalistic," "isolationist," and "independent." Because the Anglican Church conformed to the commands of the Scriptures, Jewel believed she was free to order her life according to the spirit of the Scriptures in the best interests of the Church under existing circumstances. This accommodation was accomplished in a typical English fashion--

one step at a time as circumstances dictated and problems arose.

Jewel's application of his view of the Church was more liberal than many others who worked from the same premises. He was able to differentiate the essential from the non-essential, and to compromise his personal principles in the interests of the welfare of the whole Church on indifferent matters when the authority of the Word of God was not denied. The unity of the Church of England was as close to his heart as was the unity of realm to the heart of Elizabeth, and the Reformer modified his beliefs on such a matter as the use of ecclesiastical vestments in order to maintain that unity in essentials; he supported the Royal Supremacy, despite some qualifications, for the sake of the support which the Queen alone could give the Church.

The Anglican policy of ridding the existing Church in England of anti-Scriptural abuses rather than a thorough-going reformation, together with the necessity for Jewel to make certain compromises, resulted in an unsatisfactory doctrine of the Church insofar as the Reformer made no effort to present a logical, consistent, and complete theology based on the Scriptures and the fathers. He was content to summon their authority

in support of particular doctrines and practices held by the Church of England as the necessity arose. Whereas the practices and structure of the Reformed Churches on the Continent and in Scotland were a natural issue from a definite theological position, the doctrine of the Church as it was expounded by Jewel was more a justification of the existing structure of the Elizabethan Church. When doctrines and practices were called into question by his opponents, the Bishop spoke; he felt no need, for the sake of a consistent theological position, to answer unasked questions.

Jewel's doctrine of the Church, however defective according to contemporary standards, contained the foundation for the work of later Anglican theologians. His belief in an internal priesthood within the Church composed of all believers, both clerical and lay, pointed the way to a fuller appreciation of the place of the laity in the Church. Jewel had little to say about the place of the Church in the community, but his insistence on responsible Christian conduct and the dependence of the whole realm on the spiritual and moral precepts provided by the Church foreshadowed the concept of a total ministry of the Church. The missionary task of the Church, which played such a large part in nine-



teenth and twentieth century Protestantism, was implied in Jewel's insistence that the Church was not an end in herself, but existed for all men, and that witnessing in word and action was the obligation of every Christian. The divisions in the Church which Jewel and other Reformers seemed to condone would be criticized by those who fail to realize that these men believed that they were not fragmenting the Christian Church, but were restoring it to its original unity. Union between the Church of England and other Protestant Churches would have had little meaning to the Elizabethan divines, for they believed their only divisions were political and geographical; they held that they were already united in faith and practice and were all a part of the one holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, E. S., et al. Catholicity, A Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West. London: Dacre Press, 1947.
- Ainslie, James L. The Doctrine of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1940.
- Allen, J. W. A History of Political Thought in the Sixteenth Century. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1961.
- Allison, S. F., et al. The Fulness of Christ: The Church's Growth into Catholicity. London: S.P.C.K., 1960.
- Anglican Orders: The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII. and the Answer of the Archbishops of England. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1957.
- Aquinas, St. Thomas. The "Summa Theologica" of St Thomas Aquinas. Trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province. 22 vols. London: Burns Oates and Washburn, Ltd. (n.d.).
- Arrowsmith, R. S. The Prelude to the Reformation. London: S.P.C.K., 1923.
- Attwater, Donald (ed.). The Catholic Encyclopaedia Dictionary. 2nd edition revised. London: Cassell and Co., Ltd., 1949.
- Augustine. The City of God. Trans. Demetrius Zema and Gerald Walsh. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1950.

- . Writings in Connection with the Donatist Controversy. Trans. J. R. King. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1872.
- Bainton, Ronald N. The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956.
- Bale, John. Select Works. Ed. Henry Christmas. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for The Parker Society, 1849.
- Barnes, Arthur S. Bishop Barlow and Anglican Orders. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1922.
- Barry, William. The Papal Monarchy from St Gregory the Great to Boniface VIII. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1902.
- Battenhouse, Roy W. (ed.). A Companion to the Study of Augustine. New York: Oxford University Press, 1955.
- Bell, G. K. A. Christian Unity: the Anglican Position. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1948.
- Bettenson, Henry (ed.). Documents of the Christian Church. London: Oxford University Press, 1959.
- Bickersteth, E. The Testimony of the Reformers. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1836.
- Bicknell, E. J. A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-Nine Articles. 3rd edition., revised by H. J. Carpenter. London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1954.
- Bindoff, S. T. Tudor England. Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_, et al (eds.). Elizabethan Government and Society. London: The Athlone Press, 1961.
- Binns, L. Elliott. The History of the Decline and Fall of the Medieval Papacy. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1934.

- Black, J. B. The Reign of Elizabeth, 1558-1603. 2nd edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1959.
- Blunt, J. B. Sketch of the Reformation in England. London: William Tegg, 1867.
- Booby, John Everitt. "A Study of John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey, 1960.
- Bridges, George F. The Oxford Reformers and English Church Principles: Their Rise, Trial, and Triumph. London: Elliot Stock, 1908.
- Brightman, F. B. What Objections Have Been Made to English Orders? 4th edition. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1958.
- Bromiley, G. W. Baptism and the Anglican Reformers. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. John Jewel, 1522-1571, The Apologist of the Church of England. London: Church Book Room Press, Ltd. (1948).
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). Zwingli and Bullinger. Vol. XXIV of The Library of Christian Classics. John Baillio, et al editors. 26 vols. London: S.C.M. Press, 1953.
- Brook, V. J. K. A Life of Archbishop Parker. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Brown, John. Apostolical Succession. London: Congregational Union of England and Wales, 1898.
- Brown, Robert McAfee. The Spirit of Protestantism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Bullinger, Henry. Decades. Trans. H. T., Thomas Harding ed. 4 vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1849-1852.
- Burnett, Gilbert. An Exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England. 4th edition. London: 1737.

Burn-Burdooh, H. Church, Continuity and Unity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1945.

Calendar of State Papers, Foreign Series, 1561-1562. James Stevenson ed. London: Longmans Green, Reader, and Dyer, 1866.

Calendar of State Papers, Spanish, Elizabeth I. Martin A. S. Hume ed. London: Eyre and Spottiswoodie, 1892.

Calvin, John. Calvin: Theological Treatises. J. K. S. Reid ed. Vol. XXII of The Library of Christian Classics. John Baillie, et al editors. 26 vols. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1954.

Commentary on Timothy. Trans. William Pringle. Edinburgh: T. Constable for the Calvin Translation Society, 1856.

The Institutes of the Christian Religion. Ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles. Vols. XX and XXI of The Library of Christian Classics. John Baillie, et al editors. 26 vols. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1961.

Tracts and Treatises. Trans. Henry Beveridge, notes by Thomas F. Torrance. 3 vols. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1958.

Cam, Helen. England before Elizabeth. 2nd revised edition. London: Arrow Books, 1960.

Canons and Decrees of the Sacred and Oecumenical Council of Trent. Trans. J. Waterworth. London: C. Dolman, 1848.

Cardwell, Edward. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. Oxford: The University Press, 1844.

Carey, Kenneth M. (ed.). The Historic Episcopate. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954.

Carpenter, S. C. The Church in England, 597-1688. London: John Murray, 1954.



- Carter, C. Sydney. "The Anglican 'Via Media:' A Study in the Elizabethan Religious Settlement," The Church Quarterly Review, XLVII (October 1923; January 1924), pp. 233-254.
- Carwithon, J. B. S. The History of the Church of England. 3 vols. London: Thomas Davidson, 1829.
- Chenoy, C. R. and Somple, W. H. (eds.). Select Letters of Pope Innocent III Concerning England. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953.
- Clark, William. The Anglican Reformation. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1897.
- Clarke, W. K. Lowther (ed.). Liturgy and Worship. London: S.P.C.K., 1932.
- Collins, William Edward (ed.). Queen Elizabeth's Defence of Her Proceedings in Church and State. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1958.
- Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta. Ed. Centro di Documentazione Istituito per lo Scienze Religiose-- Bologna. Basileae: Herder, 1962.
- Constitutiones et Acta Publica Imperatorum et Regum. Jacobus Schwain ed. Tom. IV, no. 105 of Monumenta Germaniae Historica. Hannoverae: Impensis Bibliopholii Hahniani, 1906.
- Cranner, Thomas. Works. John E. Cox ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1844-1846.
- Creighton, Mandell. A History of the Papacy from the Great Schism to the Sack of Rome. 6 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1904.
- "John Jewel," Dictionary of National Biography, XLIX, 373-382. London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1892.
- Cross, F. L. (ed.). The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Reprinted and corrected. London: The Oxford University Press, 1961.

- Culkin, Gerard. The English Reformation. London: Sands and Co., Ltd., 1960.
- Cunningham, A. An Essay Concerning Church Government out of the Excellent Writings of Calvin and Beza. 1692.
- Daniel-Rops, H. The Protestant Reformation. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1961.
- Davis, E. T. Episcopacy and the Royal Supremacy in the Church of England in the XVI Century. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1950.
- Davis, Rupert E. The Problem of Authority in the Continental Reformers: a Study in Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. London: The Ryworth Press, 1946.
- Doansley, Margaret. A History of the Medieval Church. London: Methuen and Co., 1925.
- Denny, Edward. The English Church and the Ministry of the Reformed Churches. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1900.
- Dictionnaire De Theologie Catholique. A. Vacant and E. Mangenot, eds. 15 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1909.
- Dillistone, F. W. (ed.). Scripture and Tradition. London: Lutterworth Press, 1955.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. The Shape of the Liturgy. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1945.
- Dixon, Richard Watson. History of the Church of England, from the Abolition of the Roman Jurisdiction. 6 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Doctrine in the Church of England. The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine Appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. London: S.P.C.K., 1922.
- Doctrine of the Church of England as Stated in Ecclesiastical Documents Set Forth by Authority of Church and State in the Reformation Period Between 1536 and 1662. London: Rivingtons, 1868.

- Bodwell, C. R. (ed.). The English Church and the Continent. London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1959.
- Bowden, John. Theological Literature of the Church of England. London: S.P.C.K., 1897.
- Dugmore, C. W. The Mass and the English Reformers. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1958.
- Dunkley, Rodoric (ed.). The Ministry and the Sacraments. London: S.C.M. Press, 1937.
- Field, Richard. Of the Church. 4 vols. Cambridge: The University Press, 1847.
- Figgis, J. Noville. Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius, 1414-1625. Reprint of the 2nd edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Theory of the Divine Right of Kings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1896.
- First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI. London: J. N. Dent and Sons (n.d.).
- Flow, R. Newton, and Davies, Rupert E. (eds.). The Catholicity of Protestantism. 4th impression. London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). The Nature of the Church. London: S.C.M. Press, Ltd., 1952.
- Formularies of Faith in the Reign of Henry VIII. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825.
- Forsyth, Peter Taylor. The Church and the Sacraments. London: The Independent Press, 1947.
- Freemantle, Anne (ed.). The Papal Encyclicals in their Historical Context. New York: Mentor Books, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). The Age of Belief. New York: Mentor Books, 1954.
- Frere, Walter H. The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1904.

- ..... • The Marian Reaction. London: S.F.C.K., 1896.
- ..... (ed.). Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation. 3 vols. London: Green and Co., 1910.
- ....., and Douglas, C. E. (eds.). Puritan Manifestoes. London: S.F.C.K., 1907.
- Fuller, Thomas. Able redevivus. London: T. Brudenell, 1651.
- ..... • The Church History of Britain. London: 1656.
- Froude, James A. History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada. 12 vols. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1870-1872..
- Garbott, Cyril. Church and State in England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1950.
- Garrott, Christiana W. The Marian Exiles. Cambridge: Macmillan and Co., 1938.
- Gee, Henry. The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion 1559-1564. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898.
- ..... • The Elizabethan Prayer Book and Ornaments with an Appendix of Documents. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1902.
- ....., and Hardy, William J. Documents Illustrative of English Church History. London: Macmillan and Co., 1896.
- George, Charles H. and Katherine. The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation 1570-1640. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Gibson, Edgar C. S. The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, Explained with an Introduction. 2 vols. London: Methuen and Co., 1897.



- Goode, W. A Vindication of the Doctrine of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches. London: Thomas Hatchard, 1852.
- Gore, Charles. The Church and the Ministry. Revised by C. H. Turner. London: S.P.C.K., 1926.
- Green, H. Benedict. "Apostolic Succession and the Anglican Appeal to History," The Church Quarterly Review, CLXIII, 348, (July-September, 1962) 293-304.
- Haddan, Arthur W. Apostolical Succession in the Church of England. London: Rivingtons, 1869.
- Harding, Thomas. An answer to maister Juell's challenge. Louvain: 1564.
- ..... A confutation of a book intituled An apologie of the Church of England. Antwerp: 1565.
- ..... A detection of sundrie and foule erreurs uttered by M. Jewel. Louvain: 1568.
- ..... A repondre to M. Jewels Replie. Antwerp: 1566.
- Hardwick, Charles. A History of the Articles of Religion. London: George Bell and Sons, 1876.
- The Harmony of Protestant Confessions. Revised and enlarged by Peter Hall. London: John F. Shaw, 1844.
- Hatch, Edwin. The Organization of the Early Christian Churches. London: Rivingtons, 1881.
- Henderson, Ernest F. (ed.). Select Historical Documents of the Middle Ages. London: George Bell and Sons, 1905.
- Henson, H. Hensley. The Relation of the Church of England to Other Reformation Churches. Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1911.



- . et al (eds.). The Church of England, Its Nature and Its Future. London: The University of London Press, Ltd., 1919.
- Herbermann, Charles G. et al (eds.). The Catholic Encyclopedia. 16 vols. London: Caxton Publishing Co., 1907-1914.
- Herbert, A. G. The Form of the Church. London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 1947.
- Hoylyn, Peter. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. London: 1661.
- Hickinbotham, J. P. "The Church of England and Inter-  
communion," The Church Quarterly Review, CXLIX  
(October-December, 1949), 1-14.
- Higham, Florence. Catholic and Reformed: A Study of  
the Anglican Church, 1559-1662. London: S.P.C.K.,  
1962.
- Hodge, Charles. The Church and Its Polity. Edinburgh:  
Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1879.
- Hooker, Richard. The Works of that Learned and Judicious  
Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker: With an Account of His  
Life and Death by Isaac Walton. John Keble arranger.  
3rd edition. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University  
Press, 1843.
- Hooper, John. Later Writings. Charles Nevinson, ed.  
Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the  
Parker Society, 1852.
- Hughes, Philip. The Reformation in England. 3 vols.  
London: Hollis and Carter, 1954.
- Humphrey, Laurence. J. Juelli, Episcopi Sarisburien-  
sis, vita et mors. London: Apud J. Dayum, 1537.
- Jackson, Samuel M. Huldorich Zwingli. New York: G.  
P. Putnam's Sons, 1901.
- . (ed.). Selected Works of Huldorich Zwingli.  
Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press,  
1901.

Jacob, E. F. Essays in the Conciliar Epoch. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1943.

Jenkins, Claude. Bishop Barlow's Consecration and Archbishop Parker's Register. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1935.

., and Mackenzie, K. B. (eds.). Episcopacy Ancient and Modern. London: S.P.C.K., 1930.

Jenkins, Daniel. The Nature of Catholicity. London: Faber and Faber, Ltd., 1941.

Jewel, John. Works. John Ayre ed. 4 vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1845-1850.

. An Apology for the Church of England to which is Prefixed a Memoir of His Life and Writings, and a Preliminary Discourse on the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of Rome. Ed. and trans. Stephen Isaacson. London: John Hearne, 1825.

. The apology of the Church of England; and an epistle to one Seignior Scipio, a Venetian gentleman, concerning the Council of Trent . . . made English by a person of quality (i.e. Hon. R. Boyle?) To which is added the life of the . . . Bishop by the same Hand. London: 1685.

. A defence of the Apologie of the Church of Englande, an Answer to a certaine booke by M. Hardinge. London: H. Wykes, 1567.

. A Replie unto N. Hardinges answere. London: H. Wykes, 1566.

. The works of J. Jewell; and a briefe discourse of his life. (by D. Featley) London: J. Norton, 1609.

Johanson, J. H. "Martin Luther on Scripture and Authority and the Church, Ministry and Sacraments," Scottish Journal of Theology. 15, no. 4 (December, 1962), 350-368.

- Kennedy, W. P. M. Elizabethan Episcopal Administration. 3 vols. London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd., for the Alcuin Club, 1924.
- Kirk, K. E. (ed.). The Apostolic Ministry. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1946.
- Knappson, M. M. Tudor Puritanism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Knox, John. Works. David Laing ed. 6 vols. Edinburgh: James Thin, 1846-1864.
- Kung, Hans. The Council and Reunion. Trans. Cecily Hastings. London: Sheed and Ward, 1961.
- Kup, Alexander Peter. "An Account of the Returned Exiles of 1553-1558 in England and Scotland." Unpublished Doctor's thesis, the University of St Andrews, 1952.
- Lacey, T. A. The Anglo Catholic Faith. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1926.
- Lagrade, Andre'. The Latin Church in the Middle Ages. Trans. Archibald Alexander. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clarke, 1915.
- Lo Das, Charles Webb. The Life of Bishop Jewel. Vol. 11 of the Theological Library. 16 vols. London: Rivingtons, 1832-1848.
- Loff, Gordon. Medieval Thought: St Augustine to Ockham. London: The Merlin Press, 1959.
- Lewis, Ewart. Medieval Political Ideas. 2 vols. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1954.
- Lewis, J. The Reformation Settlement, Being a Summary of the Public Acts and Official Documents Relating to the Law and Ritual of the Church of England from A.D. 1509 to A.D. 1666. London: Seixton, Bell and Co., 1885.
- Lindsay, T. M. History of the Reformation. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1907.

- Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. London: Macmillan and Co., 1869.
- Lloyd, Charles (ed.). Formularies of Faith put forth by Authority During the Reign of Henry VIII. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1825.
- Luther, Martin. A Compend of Luther's Theology. Hugh Thompson Kerr, Jr. ed. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1943.
- ..... \* Church and Ministry II. Conrad Dergondoff ed. Vol. 40 of Luther's Works. Helmut Lehmann gen. ed. 55 vols. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1956.
- ..... \* The Familiar Discourses of Dr. Martin Luther. Trans. Henry Bell, revised and corrected by Joseph Kerby. London: Sussex Press, 1816.
- ..... \* First Principles of the Reformation. Ed. Henry Wace and C. A. Buchheim. London: John Murray, 1883.
- ..... \* Primary Works. Trans. and ed. H. Wace and C. A. Buchheim. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.
- ..... \* Reformation Writings of Martin Luther. Trans. and notes by Bertram Lee Woolf. 2 vols. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952-1956.
- ..... \* Werke. Weimar: 1883-
- MacGrogan, Geddes. Corpus Christi. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1959.
- Machyn, Henry. The Diary of Henry Machyn, Citizen and Merchant-Tailor of London, 1550-63. J. G. Nichols ed. London: J. B. Nicholas for the Camden Society, 1848.
- MacKinnon, James. The Origins of the Reformation. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1939.
- Macpherson, John. The Doctrine of the Church in Scottish Theology. Edinburgh: Macniven and Wallace, 1903.



- Makover, Felix. The Constitutional History and Constitution of the Church of England. Trans. from the German. London: Swan Sonnenschein and Co., 1895.
- Malden, R. H. "Patostas Ordinis," The Church Quarterly Review, CXXXVII (October, December, 1943), 26-46.
- Manson, T. W. The Church's Ministry. London: Hodder and Stoughton, Ltd., 1948.
- Mason, A. J. The Church of England and Episcopacy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914.
- McGovern, J. B. "Notes on Jewel's Library," Notes and Queries, IX (1914), 401-403, 441-443, 483-484, 505-506.
- McIlwain, Charles H. The Growth of Political Thought in the West. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- McKillop, A. E. A Chronicle of the Popes from St Peter to Pius X. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1912.
- McLolland, Joseph C. The Visible Words of God. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957.
- McNeill, John T. "Doctrine of the Ministry in Reformed Theology," Church History, XII, no. 2 (June 1943), 77-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Church in Sixteenth Century Reformed Theology," The Journal of Religion, XII (1942), 251-269.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The History and Character of Calvinism. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Meyer, Arnold O. England and the Catholic Church under Queen Elizabeth. Trans. J. A. McKee. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1916.
- Moyer, Carl S. Elizabeth I and the Religious Settlement of 1559. St. Louis, Missouri: Concordia Publishing House, 1960.



- Middleton, J. W. Memoirs of the Reformers. 3 vols. London: R. B. Seeley and W. Burnside, 1828.
- Moberly, R. C. Ministerial Priesthood. London: John Murray, 1897.
- Moore, Aubrey Lackington. Lectures and Papers on the History of the Reformation. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1890.
- Morris, Christopher. Political Thought in England, Tyndale to Hooker. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- Mueller, William A. Church and State in Luther and Calvin. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1954.
- Myers, A. R. England in the Late Middle Ages. Edinburgh: Pelican Books, 1959.
- Noale, J. E. Elizabeth I and Her Parliaments, 1559-1581. London: Jonathan Cape, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Elizabethan Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity," The English Historical Review, LXV, no. cclvi (July, 1950), 304-332.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Essays in Elizabethan History. London: Jonathan Cape, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Parliament and the Articles of Religion, 1571," The English Historical Review, LXVII (October, 1952), 510-521.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Queen Elizabeth I. Edinburgh: Penguin Books, 1960.
- Neill, Charles, and Willoughby, J. M. (eds.). The Tutorial Prayer Book. London: The Harrison Trust, 1913.
- Neill, Stephen. Anglicanism. London: Pelican Books, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (ed.). The Ministry of the Church. London: The Canterbury Press, 1947.

Noibuhr, H. Richard, and Williams, Daniel H. (eds.). The Ministry in Historical Perspective. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956.

Niemeyer, H. A. (ed.). Collectio Confessionum in Ecclesiis Reformatis Publicatarum. Lipsiae: Julia Klinkhardt, 1840.

Ollard, S. L. (ed.). A Dictionary of English Church History. London: M. R. Nowbray and Co., Ltd., 1912.

Original Letters Relative to the English Reformation 1531-1558. Hastings Robinson ed. 2 vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1846-1847.

Parker, Matthew. Correspondence. John Bruce and T. T. Perrowe eds. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1853.

Parker, T. M. Christianity and State in the Light of History. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1955.

\_\_\_\_\_. The English Reformation to 1558. Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1950.

Pauck, Wilhelm. "The Idea of the Church in Christian History," Church History, XXI (September, 1952), 191-213.

Pearcy, Henri Roubelt. The Meaning of the Church in the Thought of Calvin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952.

Pearson, A. F. Scott. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1914.

Pool, Albert (ed.). The Seconde Parte of a Register. 2 vols. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1915.

Pook, A. L. Anglicanism and Episcopacy. London: The Faith Press, Ltd., 1958.

Polikan, Jaroslav. The Riddle of Roman Catholicism. New York: Abingdon Press, 1959.

Philpot, John. Works. James Schoefield ed. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1842.

Powicke, Maurice. The Reformation in England. London: The Oxford University Press, 1941.

Proctor, Francis, and Prose, Walter H. A New History of the Book of Common Prayer. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1932.

Prothero, G. W. (ed.). Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents Illustrative of the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I. 4th edition. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1949.

Quick, Oliver Chase. The Christian Sacraments. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1932.

Ratcliff, E. C. "Usage of Eucharistic Consecration, 1548-1662--II," Theology, LX, no. 444 (June, 1957), 274-275.

Relations Between Anglican and Presbyterian Churches: A Joint Report. London: S.P.C.K., 1957.

Rowso, A. L. The England of Elizabeth. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1950.

Rupp, E. G. Studies in the Making of the English Protestant Tradition. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1947.

Salmon, George. The Infallibility of the Church. London: John Murray, 1888.

Schaff, Philip. A History of the Creeds of Christendom. 3 vols. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1877.

A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham. Ed. and trans. Eugene R. Fairweather. Vol. X of The Library of Christian Classics. John Baillie et al, eds. 26 vols. London: S.C.M. Press, 1956.

- Sermons or Homilies Appointed to be Read in Churches in the Time of Queen Elizabeth of Famous Memory. London: Nuttall, Fisher, and Dixon, 1811.
- Sheldon, Henry C. History of Christian Doctrine. 2 vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1886.
- Shirley, F. J. Elizabeth's First Archbishop. London: S.P.C.K. for the Church Historical Society, 1948.
- Smith, Harold. The Creeds, Their History, Nature and Use. London: Robert Scott, 1912.
- Smith, Lacey B. Tudor Prelates and Politics. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.
- Smithen, Frederick J. Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation. London: James Clark and Co., Ltd., 1927.
- Sohn, Rudolf. Outlines of Church History. Trans. May Sinclair. Boston: Beacon Press, 1958.
- Southern, R. W. The Making of the Middle Ages. Essex: Arrow Books, 1958.
- Southgate, W. M. "The Marian Exiles and the Influence of John Calvin," History, XXVII (1942), 148-152.
- \_\_\_\_\_. John Jewel and the Problem of Doctrinal Authority. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Spinka, Matthew (ed.). Advocates of Reform from Wyclif to Erasmus. Vol. XIV of The Library of Christian Classics. John Baillie, et al, eds. 26 vols. London: S.C.M. Press, 1953.
- Statutes of the Realm, 1101-1713. A. Luders, et al, eds. 12 vols. London: 1810-1828.
- Stevenson, William. The Story of the Reformation. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Strype, John. Annals of the Reformation. 4 vols. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1824.

- ..... . Ecclesiastical Memorials. 3 vols. Oxford:  
The Clarendon Press, 1822.
- ..... . The Life and Acts of John Whitgift. 3 vols.  
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1822.
- ..... . The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker. 3 vols.  
Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1821.
- Sykes, Norman. The Church of England and Non-Episcopal  
Churches in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries.  
London: S.P.C.K., 1948.
- ..... . The Crisis of the Reformation. London:  
Geoffrey Bles, 1955.
- ..... . The English Religious Tradition. London:  
S.C.M. Press, 1953.
- ..... . Old Priest and New Presbyter. Cambridge:  
The Cambridge University Press, 1956.
- Taylor, Jeremy. Works. Ed. John Keble. 15 vols. Lon-  
don; Longman, Orme, Brown, Green, and Longmans,  
1839.
- Thils, Gustave. Les Notes De L'Eglise Dans L'Apolo-  
gotique Catholique Depuis La Reforme. Gembloux:  
J. Duculot, 1936.
- Thompson, J. V. P. Supreme Governor. London: S.P.C.K.,  
1940.
- Tierney, Brian. Foundations of the Conciliar Theory.  
Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press, 1955.
- Trench, Richard C. Lectures on Medieval Church History.  
London: Macmillan and Co., 1877.
- Tudor Tracts. Introduced by A. F. Pollard. West-  
minster: Archibald Constable and Co., Ltd., 1903.
- Ullmann, Walter. The Growth of the Papal Government  
in the Middle Ages. London: Methuen and Co., 1955.
- ..... . The Medieval Papacy, St Thomas and Beyond.  
London: The Aquin Press, 1960.



- \_\_\_\_\_. The Origins of the Great Schism. London: Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, Ltd., 1948.
- Wakeman, Henry Offley. An Introduction to the History of the Church of England. London: Rivingtons, 1908.
- Warren, M. A. C. et al. The Office of a Bishop. London: Church Book Room Press, Ltd., 1948.
- Whitebrook, J. C. Consecration of the Most Reverend Matthew Parker. London: A. R. Newbray and Company, Ltd., 1945.
- Whitgift, John. Works. 3 vols. Ed. John Ayre. Cambridge: The Cambridge University Press for the Parker Society, 1851-1853.
- Williams, A. T. P. The Anglican Tradition in the Life of England. London: S.C.M. Press, 1947.
- Williamson, James A. The Tudor Age. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1953.
- Woodhouse, H. F. Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603. London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Revised Reviews: XVI - Jewel's Apology," Theology, LXV, no. 502 (April, 1962), 139-143.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What is Meant by Succession?" Theology, LV, no. 338 (October, 1952), p. 377.
- Wordsworth, Christopher, and Maclean, Douglas. Statutes and Customs of the Cathedral Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary of Salisbury. London: William Clowes and Sons, Ltd., 1915.
- Wyclif, John. De Civili Domino. Ed. Reginald L. Poole. London: Wyclif Society, 1885.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Joannis Wiclif Trialogus. Ed. Gotthardus Lechler. Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1869.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Select English Works. Ed. Thomas Arnold. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1871.

..... Three Treatises by John Wycliffe D.D. Ed.  
James H. Todd. Dublin: Hodges and Smith, 1851.

..... Tractus De Ecclesia. Notes by Johann Loserth.  
London: Wyclif Society, 1886.

Zeeveld, W. G. Foundations of Tudor Policy. Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press, 1948.

The Zurich Letters. Ed. H. Robinson. 2 vols. Cam-  
bridge: The Cambridge University Press for the  
Parker Society, 1842-1845.

Zwingli, Ulrich. Zwingli's Samtliche Werke. Vols.  
I-V, in the Corpus Reformatorum (LXXXVIII sqq.).  
Berlin: Schwetschke un Sohn, 1905-.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS USED TO

VERIFY JEWEL'S REFERENCES

- Ambrosius. Sancti Ambrosii Opera Omnia. J. P. Migne. 2 tomm. Parisiis, 1845.
- Augustinus. Opusum Augustini. 10 tomm. in 5 vols. Lugduni, 1586.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sancti Augustini Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi, Opera Omnia. J. P. Migne. 16 tomm. Parisiis, 1841.
- Canones SS. Apostolorum Conciliorum Generalium et Provincialium. Petrus Crabbe. Lutetiae, 1620.
- Chrysostomus. Joannis Chrysostomi Opera Omnia. Opera et Studio D. Bernardi De Montfaucon, Monachi Ordinis Sancti Benedicti. 13 tomm. Parisiis, 1718-1738.
- Concilia Omnia. Petrus Crabbe. 3 tomm. Coloniae Agrippinae, 1551.
- Cusanus, Cardinalis. Opera. 3 tomm in 1 vol. Basileae, 1565.
- Cyprianus. Opera Omnia. J. P. Migne. 2 tomm. Parisiis, 1865.
- Cyrillus. Opusum. 6 tomm. Lutetiae, 1638.
- Decretum Gratiani. Sumptibus Joannis Pillehotte. Lugduni, 1613.
- Epiphanius. Epiphani Constantinae Opera Omnia. 2 tomm. Parisiis, 1622.
- Eusebius. Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae Historiae. Cantabrigiae, 1720.

Eusebius Emisensis. Divi Eusebii Emisensis Episcopi Opera. Apud Hieronymum de Marnes, et Gillelum Cauellat. Parisiis, 1575.

Fortalitium Fidei. Lugduni, 1511.

Fulgentius. S. Fulgentii Responsis Episcopi Opera. Quae Extant, Omnia. Lugduni, 1633.

Gregorius. Sancti Gregorii Papae I. Cognomento Magni Opera Omnia. 4 tomm. Parisiis, 1705.

Hieronymus. Hieronymi Opera Omnia. J. P. Migno. 9 tomm. in 3 vols. Parisiis, 1845-1846.

Hilarius. Sancti Hilarii Opera Omnia. J. P. Migno. Parisiis, 1844.

Ignatius. S. P. N. Ignatii Epistolae. J. P. Migne. Parisiis, 1857.

Ireanus. Sancti Irenei Opera. Joannis Baptistae Coignard. Parisiis, 1710.

Lirinensis, Vincentii. Sanctorum Presbyterorum Salviani Massiliensis et Vincentii Lirienensis Opera. Editio secunda. Parisiis, 1669.

Origenes. Origenis Opera Omnia. Ed. C. H. E. Lomatzsch. 25 tomm. Berlini, 1831-1848.

Tertullianus. Tertulliani Opera Omnia. J. P. Migne. 2 tomm. Parisiis, 1844.

Theodorotus. Theodoretii Operum. 4 tomm. Lutetiae, 1624-1684.

Theophylactus. Theophylacti Opera Omnia. 4 tomm. Venetiis, 1754-1763.

Vigilius. Divi Vigilli Contra Euthycen. Apud H. Morhardum. Tubingae, 1528.